



MARIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PLAN

July 1, 2026 – June 30, 2029

*Advancing Educational Excellence Through Equity, Inclusion, Access, and
Workforce Diversity*

Board of Trustees Approved [Approval Date]

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Section	Title	Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Definitions	
3	Policy Statement	3
4	Delegation of Responsibility, Authority and Compliance	
5	Advisory Council	
6	Complaint Procedures	
7	Notification to District Employees	
8	Training for Screening Committees	
9	Notification to Community Organizations	
10	Longitudinal Analysis of District Workforce and Applicant Pool	
11	Analysis of Degree of Underrepresentation and Significant Underrepresentation	
12	Methods to Address Any Underrepresentation	
13	Additional Measures and Methods to Support Equal Employment Opportunity Initiatives	
Appendix A	Supporting Data and Analysis	
Appendix B	EEO Plan component 13	

Plan Component 1: Introduction

The Marin Community College District (District) Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan reflects the District's ongoing commitment to equal employment opportunity and workforce diversity. The District actively works to ensure employment practices are fair, equitable, and free from discrimination, and to foster a work environment that is welcoming, inclusive, and supportive of all employees and applicants.

The District serves a diverse community representing a broad range of racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, as well as varying national origins, religions, ages, disabilities, sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions, and political perspectives. The District recognizes that a diverse workforce strengthens institutional effectiveness, enriches the educational environment, and supports student success.

The District's Board of Trustees (Board) adopted the EEO Plan on March 12, 2024. The This Plan reflects the District's commitment to equal employment opportunity in recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and other employment practices in accordance with Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, section 53000 et seq. The Plan includes procedures for addressing complaints alleging noncompliance with EEO requirements, establishes the role of the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Council (EEOAC) in supporting implementation efforts, identifies measures designed to promote equal employment opportunity, and outlines procedures for dissemination and ongoing evaluation of the Plan.

The District is committed to employing qualified administrators, faculty, and staff who are dedicated to student success and who value the contributions of individuals from diverse backgrounds and experiences. The District recognizes that diversity among employees promotes cultural awareness, mutual respect, and meaningful representation for students and employees alike. Accordingly, the District shall maintain a continuing equal employment opportunity program designed to foster an inclusive workforce, expand employment opportunities, and support equitable employment outcomes. This Plan outlines the strategies and measures through which the District will fulfill these commitments.

Current Revisions adopted by the Board of Trustees: *March 12, 2024*

Plan Component 2: Definitions

Reference: California Code of Regulations ("CCR"), Title 5, § 53001

Adverse Impact: "Adverse impact" means a disproportionate negative impact to group protected from discrimination pursuant to Government Code section 12940, arising from the effects of an employment practice as determined according to a valid statistical measure (such as those outlined in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's "Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures").

Diversity: "Diversity" means a condition of broad inclusion in an employment environment that offers equal employment opportunity for all persons. The achievement of diversity within a workforce requires the presence, respectful treatment, and inclusion of individuals from a wide range of ethnic, racial, age, national origin, religious, gender, sexual orientation, disability and socio-economic backgrounds, in all aspects of the workplace.

Equal Employment Opportunity: "Equal employment opportunity" means that all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion and to enjoy the benefits of employment with the District. Equal employment opportunity should exist at all levels, in all job categories. Equal employment opportunity also involves:

- (1) Identifying and eliminating barriers to employment that are not job related, such as reliance on preferred job qualifications that do not reasonably predict job performance;
- (2) Updating job descriptions and/or job announcements to reflect accurately the knowledge, skills and abilities of the position, including a commitment to equity; and
- (3) Creating an environment that fosters cooperation, acceptance, democracy, and free expression of ideas, and is welcoming to all persons free from discrimination related to the categories protected by Government Code section 12940.

Equal Employment Opportunity Plan: An "equal employment opportunity plan" is a written document that describes the District's EEO program. The District's EEO Plan shall include: 1) analysis of the District's work force; and 2) descriptions of the District's program and strategies, informed by the District's workforce analysis, that it is implementing or will implement, to promote equal employment opportunity.

Equal Employment Opportunity Program: An "equal employment opportunity program" refers to the combination of District strategies implemented to promote equal employment opportunity. Such programs should be informed by the District's longitudinal workforce and applicant analyses.

In-House or Promotional Only: "In-house or promotional only" hiring means that only existing District employees are eligible for a position.

Job Categories: For purposes of this EEO Plan, "job categories" includes faculty, administrative/managerial, service and maintenance, skilled craft, technical and professional, clerical/secretarial and professional non-faculty.

Monitored Group: “Monitored group” means groups for which the District must provide demographic data pursuant to section 53004.

Person with a Disability: “Person with a disability” means any person who:

- (1) has a physical or mental impairment as defined in Government Code section 12926 which limits one or more of such person's major life activities;
- (2) has a record of such an impairment; or
- (3) is regarded as having such an impairment.

A person with a disability is “limited” if the condition makes the achievement of the major life activity difficult.

Reasonable accommodation: “Reasonable accommodation” means the efforts made by the District in compliance with Government Code section 12926.

Screening or selection procedure: “Screening or selection procedure” means any measure, combination of measures, or procedure used as a basis for any employment decision. Selection procedures include the full range of assessment techniques, including performance tests, physical, educational, and work experience requirements, interviews, application reviews, and similar techniques. Screening and selection procedures shall also include consideration of equivalencies pursuant to Sections 53022 and 53430 and applicant pool review pursuant to Section 53023.

Underrepresented Group: “Underrepresented group” means any monitored group for which the percentage of persons from that group employed by the District in a job category is below eighty percent (80%) of the projected representation for that group and job category. Compares the percentage of individuals from a hired group vs. service area. The CCCC recognition use of service area demographics as a more accurate method to determine projected representation is unavailable.

Utilization analysis: according to the U.S. Department of Labor is a series of separate but interrelated analyses are used to identify whether a contractor employs minorities or women in the workforce at a rate that would be expected based upon their availability for employment.

Underutilization: refer to the presence of fewer minorities or women in a particular job group than would reasonably be expected, given their availability.

Significantly underrepresented groups: where actual representation is below 80 percent of projected representation. The analysis conducted to identify significant underrepresentation is commonly referred to as an “utilization analysis

Plan Component 3: Policy Statement

References: CCR, Title 5, § 53002

The District recognizes that its commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, belonging, and equal employment opportunity strengthens its mission and advances student success. A diverse and inclusive workforce enhances the educational experience by bringing a broad range of perspectives, experiences, and ideas that support innovation, cultural responsiveness, and student achievement. Equal employment opportunity extends beyond equitable hiring practices to include the development and maintenance of inclusive, respectful, and equitable workplaces where all employees can contribute and thrive. The District is committed to fostering a workforce that reflects and values the diversity of the communities it serves and to creating educational and employment environments that promote collaboration, mutual respect, acceptance, free expression of ideas, and institutional excellence.

The Board of Trustees is committed to recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and professional development practices that advance equal employment opportunity and support diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism. The District provides equal employment opportunities to all qualified applicants and employees and prohibits discrimination, harassment, and retaliation in any District program, activity, or employment practice based on race, ethnicity, color, national origin, immigration status, ancestry, religion, age, sex, pregnancy, childbirth, breastfeeding, related medical conditions, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, physical or mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, military or veteran status, family and medical leave status, or any other characteristic protected by applicable federal or state law, including perceived characteristics or association with individuals possessing such characteristics.

Through these efforts, the District seeks to cultivate an inclusive and welcoming environment where employees are empowered to support student learning, engagement, belonging, and achievement. By advancing equitable employment practices and fostering a culture of inclusion, the District strengthens its ability to fulfill its educational mission and support positive outcomes for all students.

This Policy Statement is consistent with and incorporates by reference Board Policies 1200 (Mission), 3410 (Nondiscrimination), 3420 (Equal Employment Opportunity), 7100 (Commitment to Diversity), and 7160 (Professional Development).

Plan Component 4: Delegation of Responsibility, Authority and Compliance

Reference: CCR, Title 5, § 53003(c)(3) and § 53020

Equal employment opportunity requires a commitment and contribution from all District employees and the governing board. The responsibilities for the effective implementation of the EEO Plan are as follows:

1. District Governing Board

The Governing Board is responsible for adopting a Plan that is in compliance with the provisions of the California Code of Regulations. Further, the Board of Trustees will oversee the Chancellor's responsibility to ensure the EEO Plan shall:

- a. Be developed in collaboration with the District's Equal Employment Advisory Committee;*
- b. Be reviewed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees where it is agendaized as a separate action item;*
- c. Cover a period of 3 years, after which a new or revised plan shall be adopted; and*
- d. Be submitted to the State Chancellor's Office at least 90 days prior to its adoption. Comments received from the Chancellor's Office on the proposed plan must be presented to the governing board prior to adoption." See Section 53003 a) and Section 53020 (a).*

2. Superintendent/President

The Board delegates to the Superintendent/President the responsibility for ongoing implementation of the EEO Plan and for providing leadership in support of the District's equal employment opportunity policies and procedures, delegating such authority as appropriate. The Superintendent/President will advise the Board concerning statewide equal employment opportunity policy emanating from the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and direct the publication of an annual report on the EEO Plan implementation. The Superintendent/President will evaluate the performance of administrative staff who report directly to the Superintendent/President on their ability to follow and implement the EEO Plan.

3. Equal Employment Opportunity Officer

The District has designated the Vice President of Human Resources as its EEO Officer who is responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the EEO Plan. If the designation of the EEO Officer changes before this EEO plan is next revised, the District will notify employees and applicants for employment of the new designee. The EEO Officer or designee is responsible for administering, implementing, and monitoring the EEO Plan and ensuring compliance with the requirements of Title 5, Section 53000 *et seq.* The EEO Officer or designee is also responsible for ensuring that applicant pools and selection procedures are properly monitored as required by Title 5, sections 53023 and 53024; preparing annual reports; and receiving complaints described in Component 6 of the EEO Plan and ensuring that such complaints are promptly and impartially investigated. The EEO Officer or designee shall ensure prompt and effective implementation of the requirements of the Plan, work to achieve employee diversity, and avoid disparate impacts, consistent with state and federal law.

4. Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Council (EEOAC)

The District has established an EEOAC to act as an advisory body to the EEO Officer or designee and the District as a whole to promote understanding and support of EEO policies and procedures. The EEOAC will assist in the development and implementation of the EEO Plan in conformance with state and federal regulations and guidelines, monitor equal employment opportunity progress, provide strategies to meet the Plan requirements, and provide suggestions for EEO Plan revisions, as appropriate. The EEOAC shall operate in accordance with Plan Component 5.

5. Screening Committees

A screening committee member, or any organization or individual, whether or not an employee of the District, who acts on behalf of the Board with regard to the recruitment and screening of personnel is subject to the requirements of the EEO Plan and applicable Title 5 provisions.

6. Agents of the District

Any organization or individual, who participates in District recruitment or screening of personnel, whether as an employee, which includes faculty, staff, volunteers, student workers, and administrators of the Marin Community College District or as a contractor, a person or entity, including an auxiliary organization, that agrees to conduct work for the District as specified under the terms of a contract or agreement, whether or not an employee of the District, who acts on behalf of the governing board with regard to the recruitment and screening of personnel, is an agent of the District for such purposes only and is subject to all requirements of the EEO Plan.

7. Hiring Manager

The hiring manager is an administrator or supervisor, who is responsible for chairing the screening committee, ensure hiring process is followed in accordance with policies and procedures, the hiring manager is an agent of the District for all employment requirements, including the EEO Plan.

Consistent with the authority established in this Plan Component and throughout this EEO Plan, the District shall engage in continuous, good-faith efforts to implement the provisions of the EEO Plan, promote workforce diversity, advance equitable employment outcomes, and identify and eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunity. The District shall regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its EEO efforts and take appropriate action to address underrepresentation and mitigate disparate impact, consistent with applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

Plan Component 5: Advisory Council

Reference: CCR, Title 5, § 53005

The District has established the EEOAC to assist the District in developing, revising, and implementing District EEO Programs and the EEO Plan. The Council will include a diverse membership of individuals committed to equal employment opportunity, diversity and inclusion. The EEOAC may sponsor and support events, training, or other activities that promote equal employment opportunity, nondiscrimination, retention and diversity. When appropriate, the EEOAC will make recommendations to the Board, the Superintendent/President, or the EEO Officer to update the EEO Plan in accordance with applicable policies, procedures, and legislation.

The EEO Officer will ensure that the EEOAC and all members of the Board receive training in all of the following:

- a. The requirements of Title 5, Section 53003 and of state and federal nondiscrimination laws;
- b. Identification and elimination of bias in hiring;
- c. The educational benefits of workforce diversity; and
- d. The role of the EEOAC in drafting and implementing the District's EEO Plan.

1. EEO Advisory Council Structure

The EEOAC shall be composed of a diverse membership and include members from District stakeholder groups, including, but not limited to, students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators.

The Superintendent/president appoints the EEOAC which will be comprised of individuals interested in and committed to equal employment opportunity – including a minimum of two faculty, two classified professionals, two administrators, and two students. The EEOAC will vote to establish two co-chairs and a secretary and to decide on term limits. Other interested employees or students may be invited to support the EEOAC work through focused work groups.

The EEOAC will meet a minimum of four times each fiscal year and will set meeting agendas, and take and distribute meeting minutes. Additional EEOAC meetings may be established as determined by the EEOAC.

The EEOAC's primary focus will include promoting an understanding and support of equal employment opportunity and nondiscrimination policies, review and advise on recruitment procedures and program activities. The EEOAC will sponsor or support training, cultural events, and educational programs that support and promote equal employment opportunity, nondiscrimination, workforce diversity and retention.

Additional information regarding the EEOAC's responsibilities is included in Administrative Procedures 3420 – Equal Employment Opportunity.

Plan Component 6: Complaint Procedures

References: CCR, Title 5, §§ 53003(c)(4), 53026, and 59300 et seq.; BP/AP 3410 Non-Discrimination; AP 3435 Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Procedures

Any person may file a complaint alleging the District violated the Title 5's equal employment opportunity regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 53000 *et seq.*). Any person who wishes to file such a complaint should use the District's filing procedures for employment-related complaints, found in Board Policy 3410 and Administrative Procedure 3435.

The District may request, but shall not require a complainant to submit a complaint on the form prescribed by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges. A copy of the form is available on the District's website Prevention of Discrimination and Harassment at [Prevention of Discrimination and Harassment](#) or located at the departments listed below:

Human Resources Department	Office of the Superintendent/President	Student Activities and Advocacy Office (SAA)
Indian Valley Campus Building 11, Second Floor 1800 Ignacio Boulevard Novato, CA 94949	Kentfield Campus Academic Center 835 College Avenue Kentfield, California 94904	Kentfield Campus Center for Student Success (CSS) Third Floor, CSS 835 College Avenue Kentfield, California 94904

A complainant must report a verbal complaint to the Vice President of Human Resources. A complainant should contact the District EEO Officer and Compliance Officer, Vice President of Human Resources, by phone at (415) 485-9340 or in person at the District's Human Resources Department, Building 11, Second Floor, 1800 Ignacio Boulevard, Novato, CA 94949. The Vice President of Human Resources or designee will record the verbal complaint in writing. The Vice President of Human Resources will take steps to ensure the writing accurately reflects the facts alleged by the complainant. Complaints must be filed with the Vice President of Human Resources unless the person submitting the complaint alleges a violation against the Vice President of Human Resources, in which case the complaint should be submitted directly to the District's Superintendent/President. Complaints regarding employment matters must be filed either verbally or in writing within 180 days.

The District's discrimination and harassment complaint form and procedures can be accessed at the following links: [Unlawful Discrimination Form](#) and [Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Procedures](#). While the District's procedures for receiving EEO complaints are the same as the procedures for receiving complaints of discrimination and harassment, depending on the nature of an EEO complaint, the procedures and timeline for processing such complaints may differ slightly.

Plan Component 7: Notification to District Employees

The District's EEO Policy Statement (located in Component 3 of this EEO Plan) is posted online on the District's website and printed in the college catalogs, schedule of courses, program brochures and related materials.

The EEO Plan, including revisions thereto, will be disseminated annually via email to the Board, college administrators, and employees of the District by the Superintendent/President or their designee. The annual notice will contain the following provisions:

1. The EEO Plan will be available on the District's website under the "[Office of the President](#)" and "[Equal Employment Opportunity](#)" page.
2. The EEO Policy Statement and EEO Plan will be made available to new employees through the on-boarding/new employee orientation process.
3. The importance of employees' participation and responsibility in ensuring the EEO Plan's implementation.
4. The District will provide new employees a paper or electronic copy of the District's Non-Discrimination policy, and this EEO Plan and its policy statement setting forth the District's commitment to an EEO plan at the commencement of employment.
5. The District will provide screening committees a paper or electronic copy of this EEO Plan and its policy statement.

Plan Component 8: Training for Screening Committees

Reference: CCR, Title 5, §§ 53003(c)(6) and 53020(c)

Any individual or organization who participates in District recruitment and screening of Personnel, whether as a District employee or official or as a third-party, is subject to all of the Title 5 regulations on equal employment opportunity (Section 53000, *et. seq.*) and are expected to comply with the District's EEO Plan. All individuals directly participating in the selection and screening process shall receive training prior to their initial participation on a screening committee. Following their initial training, a person serving on any subsequent screening or selection committee must have received training within the 24 months prior of their service on such committee. This training is mandatory; individuals who have not received this training as described in this paragraph will not be allowed to serve on screening or selection committees. The Human Resources Department is responsible for ensuring that all individuals serving on a screening or selecting committee receive this mandatory training.

The mandatory training will include, but may not be limited to:

- a. The requirement of the Title 5 regulations on equal employment opportunity (Section 53000 *et. seq.*) and the requirements of federal and state non-discrimination laws;
 - b. The educational benefits of workforce diversity;
 - c. The elimination of bias in hiring decisions; and
 - d. Best practices in serving on a screening or selection committee.
- Screening and selection committees shall include a diverse membership to ensure a variety of perspectives are included in the assessment of applicants. If the EEO Officer or designee determines that the screening committee membership should be more diverse. In that case, the EEO Officer will work with Superintendent/president and academic and classified senate presidents to appoint additional members as needed. In addition, the EEO Officer or designee may delay the recruitment due to the lack of a diverse membership until full representation of the screening committee. In addition, all committee members will be provided with training materials prior to serving on recruitment to include but not limited to:
 - [MCCD Screening Committee Guide - Hiring Process & Best Practices](#)
 - [Screening Committee Training: Elimination of Bias in Hiring and Employment](#)
 - [EEOC Prohibited Employment Policies & Practices](#)
 - [Screening Committee Composition Guidelines](#)
 - [Screening Committee Confidentiality Agreement & Nepotism Declaration](#)
 - [Recruitment Process for Hiring Managers](#)

Plan Component 9: Notification to Community Organizations

References: CCR, Title 5, 53003(c)(7)

The EEO Officer will provide an annual written notice disseminated by email of the District's EEO Plan to appropriate community-based and professional organizations. The notice will include the following:

- a) An email link of the EEO Plan and where it can be found on the District's website;
- b) A request for their assistance in identifying a qualified, diverse pool of applicants;
- c) The website address where the District posts job openings;
- d) The contact information for the District's employment team.

The District will seek to reach those institutions, organizations and agencies that may be recruitment sources, including the following, which may be revised from time to time as necessary:

10,000 Degrees

1401 Los Gamos Dr., Suite 205, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-459-4240

10000Degrees.org

Aliados Health

1310 Redwood Way, Suite 135, Petaluma, CA 94954

(707) 792-7900

AliadosHealth.org

American Association of University Women (AAUW Marin)

PO Box 4106, San Rafael, CA 94913

Not publicly listed

Marin-CA.AAUW.net

American Psychological Association

750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

APA.org

Arnold Advocacy

Novato, CA (mailing/contact addresses vary)

(415) 516-0482

ArnoldAdvocacy.com

Art with Impact

Organization operates virtually; public contact available online

Not readily listed

ArtWithImpact.org

Association of California Community College Administrators

1531 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814

916-443-3559

ACCCA.org

Autistry Studios

448 Du Bois St., San Rafael, CA 94901

(415) 454-1037

AutistryStudios.com

Back to the Start

PO Box 150778, San Rafael, CA 94915

(415) 871-3669

BackToTheStart.org

Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC)

2100 Moorpark Ave., San Jose, CA 95128

415-267-6544

BACCC.net

Bay Area Community Resources (BACR)

11175 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA 94530

Marin program office: (415) 898-2121

BACR.org

Blacks In Higher Education

5443 Fremontia Lane, San Diego, CA 92115

800-311-0563

BlacksInHigherEd.com

Bridge the Gap College Prep

2330 Marinship Way, Suite 302,
Sausalito, CA 94965

(415) 272-1931

BTGCollegePrep.org

Bucklew Programs

201 Alameda del Prado, Suite 103,
Novato, CA 94949

415-457-6964

Bucklew.org

By the Bay Health

17 E. Sir Francis Drake Blvd.,
Larkspur, CA 94939

415-927-2273

ByTheBayHealth.org

Cal Jobs

2570 Coral Landings Blvd., Palm Harbor,
FL 34684

877-622-4997

CalJobs.ca.gov

**California Community Colleges
Registry**

PO Box 4065, Modesto, CA 95352

800-245-4157

CCCRegistry.org

Canal Alliance

91 Larkspur Street, San Rafael,
CA 94901

415-454-2640

CanalAlliance.org

CareerPoint North Bay

120 N. Redwood Drive, San Rafael, CA
94903

415-966-0860

CareerPointNorthBay.org

Center for Domestic Peace

734 A Street, San Rafael, CA 94901

415-457-2464 office; 415-924-6616
24-hour hotline

CenterForDomesticPeace.org

Centers of Excellence

415-267-6544

COECCC.net

Chronicle of Higher Education

1255 23rd Street N.W., Washington,
D.C. 20037

202-466-1050

Chronicle.com

Community Action Marin

555 Northgate Dr., San Rafael, CA
94903

415-526-7500

Camarin.org

**Community Media Center of
Marin - Marin TV**

819 A Street, San Rafael, CA
94901

415-721-0636

CommunityMediaMarin.org

Conservation Core

27 Larkspur Street, San Rafael, CA
94901

415-454-4554

CCNorthBay.org

**Contra Costa County Office of
Education**

77 Santa Barbara Road, Pleasant Hill,
CA 94523

925-942-3388

CCCOE.k12.ca.us

**Dominican University of
California**

50 Acacia Ave., San Rafael, CA
94901

415-457-4440

Dominican.edu

EDD

PO Box 826880, MIC 57, Sacramento,
CA 94280-0001

415-749-7503

EDD.ca.gov

Enriching Lives through Music (ELM)

2960 Kerner Blvd., San Rafael, CA
94901

415-870-9053

ELMProgram.org

**Fair Housing Advocates of
Northern California (FHANC)**

851 Irwin Street, Suite 218, San
Rafael, CA 94901

415-457-5025

FairHousingNorCal.org

HigherEdJobs

715 Lake St., #400, Oak Park, IL 60301

(814) 861-3080 x 204

HigherEdJobs.com

Hispanics in Higher Education

5443 Fremontia Lane, San Diego, CA 92115

800-311-0563

HispanicsinHigherEd.com

Indeed, Inc.

200 West 6th Street, Floor 36, Austin, TX 78701

(203) 902-4611

Indeed.com

Insight into Diversity

50 Crestwood Executive Center, Suite 526, St. Louis, MO 63126

314-200-9955

InsightintoDiversity.com

League of Women Voters of Marin County

4340 Redwood Highway, Suite F-133, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-507-0824

MarinLWV.org

Legal Aid of Marin

1401 Los Gamos Drive, Suite 101, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-492-0230

LegalAidMarin.org

LITA (Love Is The Answer)

4340 Redwood Highway, E-352, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-472-5482

LITAMarin.org

Make It Home

Mailing: 369-B Third St. #331, San Rafael, CA 94901; warehouse is in Novato

415-578-3205

MakeItHomeBayArea.org

Marin Builders Association

660 Las Gallinas Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-462-1220

MarinBuilders.com

Marin Child Care Council

1600 Los Gamos Drive, Suite 365, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-472-1092

MC3Web.org

Marin County Fire/Fire Foundry

33 Castlerock Ave., Woodacre, CA 94973

415-473-6717

MarinCounty.gov

Marin County Foster Youth Association

Closest verified organization: Marin Foster Care Association, 55 Mitchell Blvd., Suite 2, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-507-0557

MarinFosterCare.org

Marin County Office of Education

1111 Las Gallinas Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-472-4110

MarinSchools.org

Marin Economic Forum

1050 Northgate Dr. #54, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-483-9332

MarinEconomicForum.org

Marin Interfaith Council

1510 Fifth Ave., San Rafael, CA 94901

415-456-6957

MarinIFC.org

Marin Organizing Committee

369B Third Street #333, San Rafael, CA 94901

415-563-0262

MOC-IAF.org

Marin Promise Partnership

101 Lucas Valley Road, Suite 360, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-294-1502

MarinPromisePartnership.org

Mental Health Advocates of Marin

3270 Kerner Blvd., Suite C, San Rafael, CA 94901

415-457-4554

MHAMarin.org

Multicultural Center of Marin

709 Fifth Ave., San Rafael, CA 94901

415-526-2486

MulticulturalMarin.org

North Marin Community Services

680 Wilson Ave., Novato, CA 94947

415-892-1643

NorthMarinCS.org

Novato High School

625 Arthur Street, Novato, CA 94947

415-798-5021

NUSD.org

NUSD

1015 7th Street, Novato, CA 94945

415-897-4201

NUSD.org

Parent Services Project

79 Belvedere St., Suite 101, San Rafael, CA 94901

415-454-1870

ParentServices.org

Play Marin

P.O. Box 530, Sausalito, CA 94966

415-686-5045

PlayMarin.org

Postpartum Support Center

4162 Redwood Highway, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-320-6707

PostpartumSC.org

San Francisco County Office of Education

555 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

415-241-6000

CDE.ca.gov

San Rafael City Schools

310 Nova Albion Way, San Rafael, CA 94903

415-492-3200

SRCS.org

Side By Side

300 Sunny Hills Drive, Building 5, San Anselmo, CA 94960

415-457-3200

SideBySideYouth.org

Sonoma County Office of Education

5340 Skylane Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

707-524-2600

SCOE.org

Vivalon

Healthy Aging Campus: 999 Third St., San Rafael, CA 94901

415-456-9062

Vivalon.org

West Marin Community Services

11431 State Route One, Suite 10, Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

415-663-8361

WestMarinCommunityServices.org

Workforce Alliance of the North Bay

1546 1st Street, Napa, CA 94559

415-966-0860

WorkforceAllianceNorthBay.org

Youth Transforming Justice

734 A Street, Suite 3, San Rafael, CA 94901

415-686-1356

YTJustice.org

Plan Component 10: Process for Gathering Information and Periodic Longitudinal Analysis of District Workforce and Applicant Pool

References: CCR, Title 5, §§ 53003(c)(8), 53004, and 53006

The District will gather the information specified below for the purpose of conducting periodic, longitudinal analysis of the District's employees and applicants, broken down by number of persons from monitored groups in each job category to determine whether additional diversification measures are required and to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of those measures. The District shall conduct this data review as part of its EEO Plan renewal and may conduct additional periodic data reviews more frequently based on the District's size, demographics, and other unique factors.

EEO DATA COLLECTION

The District provides applicants and conducts annual employee surveys with the opportunity to voluntarily self-identify their gender (including non-binary identities), race/ethnicity, and, where applicable, disability status, in a manner prescribed by the Chancellor's Office and consistent with applicable state and federal law ("EEO Data").

The District maintains the confidentiality of EEO Data and use such information solely for research, monitoring, evaluating the effectiveness of the District's Equal Employment Opportunity Program, and other purposes authorized by law.

Members of screening and selection committees shall not have access to applicants' EEO Data during any stage of the screening or selection process. Following the completion of the process, access to EEO Data shall be limited to District employees whose official job responsibilities require such access, unless disclosure is otherwise required by law.

The District allows applicants and employees to provide the following Monitored Group information:

1. Gender Identification

The District requests that employees and applicants self-identify as female, male, or non-binary.

2. Race and Ethnicity Identification

The District requests that employees and applicants self-identify into the following ethnicity categories:

a. Hispanic or Latino

A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.

b. White (Not Hispanic or Latino)

A person having origins in any of the original people of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

c. Black or African American (Not Hispanic or Latino)

A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Not Hispanic or Latino)

A person having origins in any of the peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

e. Filipino

A person having origins in the Philippines.

f. Southwest Asia/North Africa/Middle East

(1) A major Middle Eastern group, including, but not limited to, Afghan, Bahraini, Emirati, Iranian, Iraqi, Israeli, Jordanian, Kuwaiti, Lebanese, Omani, Palestinian, Qatari, Saudi Arabian, Syrian, Turkish, and Yemeni.

(2) A major North African group, including, but not limited to, Algerian, Djiboutian, Egyptian, Libyan, Mauritanian, Moroccan, Somali, Sudanese, and Tunisian.

(3) A major transnational Middle Eastern and North African group, including, but not limited to, Amazigh or Berber, Armenian, Assyrian, Chaldean, Circassian, and Kurdish.

g. American Indian or Alaska Native (Not Hispanic or Latino)

A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment.

h. Two or More Races

All persons who identify with more than one of the above five races (White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native). For the purposes of this group, identifying as Hispanic or Latino and only one of the listed five race groups does NOT qualify under this category.

3. Disability Identification

The District requests that all employees self-identify their disability status, if any, by using the following definition, consistent with the Fair Employment and Housing Act:

a. "Disabled person" ("Yes" on application)

Any person who (1) has a physical or mental impairment which limits one or more of such person's major life activities, (2) has a record of such impairment, or (3) is regarded as having such impairment.

b. "Major life activities" ("No" on application)

Functions such as caring for one's self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, talking, breathing, learning, and working.

4. Veteran

A person who has served in the United States military.

EEO DATA COLLECTION MONITORED GROUP IDENTIFICATION ISSUE

There may be significant numbers of employees or applicants who decline to identify their gender, race/ethnicity, or disability status with the District. The District shall make an effort to capture this information accurately, and it encourages all persons to provide the above data. The District understands that employees and applicants voluntarily submit EEO Data and will not require employees or applicants to respond. The District will survey employees to provide the opportunity to self identify their gender, race/ethnicity, or disability status with the District. This information is confidential and separated from the applicant's material that is forwarded to the screening committee and hiring administrator(s).

LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS TO IDENTIFY ADVERSE IMPACT

Once the District gathers the EEO Data described above, the District's Human Resources Department will assign every employee and applicant to one of the seven job categories identified in component 2 and within the classifications below.

1. Faculty
2. Administrative/Managerial
3. Classified – Service Maintenance
4. Classified – Skilled Crafts
5. Classified – Tech Paraprofessional
6. Classified – Clerical / Secretarial
7. Classified – Professional Non-Faculty

The District will also include data for employees and applicants that allows the District to track the composition and diversity of who is hired and retained over time, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, race and ethnicity, disability and veteran status.

The District will then conduct a periodic, longitudinal analysis of employees and applicants broken down by classifications. The District will then compare the initial applicant pool and new hires categories with the District's workforce data published by the Planning, Research & Institutional Effectiveness Department broken down by gender, ethnicity, classification status with the District in each job category to determine whether additional diversification measures are required.

Specifically, the District will compare the District's service area to the hired category to identify any adverse impact of the District's pre-hiring and hiring strategies, which exists where the selection rate for a monitored group is less than four-fifths (or 80%) of the selection rate for the group with the highest rate.

Appendix A: EEO Analysis Summary Report presents a summarized report of the College of Marin's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) analyses, which were conducted to assess workforce representation and evaluate recruitment and hiring practices in support of the District's commitment to equal employment opportunity. The analyses include an Availability Analysis, a Longitudinal Hiring analysis, and a Longitudinal Hiring Phase Analysis of the hiring process. Together, these assessments provide information regarding the demographic composition of the College's workforce, the representation of monitored groups relative to expected availability, and hiring outcomes across applicant groups. The purpose of these analyses is to identify potential barriers to equal employment opportunity, support compliance with applicable EEO requirements, and inform strategies to

promote equitable recruitment and hiring practices.

The Availability Analysis indicated that some target demographics are underutilized in specific job classifications. Asian employees are underutilized in the faculty job classification. Female employees are underutilized in the service maintenance classification. Hispanic/Latino employees are underutilized in the and faculty classification. Additionally, the analysis showed White and Male workers as underutilized in specific job classifications; however, those are not monitored groups. Underutilization occurs when the representation of minorities or women in a job group is lower than would reasonably be expected given their availability in the relevant labor market. A group is considered significantly underrepresented when its actual representation falls below 80 percent of its projected representation. The process of assessing representation levels and identifying significant underrepresentation is known as a utilization analysis.

The Longitudinal Hiring Analysis concluded that Asian applicants were hired less than expected in technical paraprofessional and clerical/secretarial classifications. In some instances, White and Male workers were labeled as having a disparity between actual vs. expected hiring rates, but those are not monitored groups.

The Longitudinal Hiring Phase Analysis concluded that across job classifications, statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates were identified for several demographic groups at various stages of the hiring process. The most frequent findings involved Asian, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino applicants, with disparities appearing in both early-stage screening activities, such as Application Received, Minimum Qualification Screening, and Committee Screening, and later-stage hiring decisions, such as Interview Pending, Interview, 2nd Interview, and the Offering stages. Female applicants were also identified in several classifications, specifically the Minimum Qualification Screening, Interview Pending, 2nd Interview, and Offering stages.

Additionally, a [matrix table](#) was developed to support findings across each phase of the Hiring Phase Analysis for all job classifications. Asian applicants had at least a marginally statistically significant disparity at the Application Received phase across every classification. Hispanic/Latino applicants achieved the highest pass rates in all but one classification during the Interview Pending phase; however, they experienced at least a marginally statistically significant disparity in all but one classification during the subsequent Interview phase. White applicants demonstrated a statistically significant disparity during the Second Interview phase in all but one classification.

Disability and Veteran Data and Reporting

The District collects disability status data for both employees and applicants. However, limitations within the District's current Enterprise Resource Planning system have restricted its ability to extract, analyze, and report this data in a manner that ensures accuracy, consistency, and reliability. The District is actively exploring solutions to enhance reporting capabilities and data integrity. As these capabilities are developed and validated, the District intends to incorporate longitudinal disability analyses into future EEO Plans to support ongoing evaluation of workforce representation and employment practices.

Consistent with applicable Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) regulations and reporting requirements, the District will collect, analyze and report veteran status data from both employees and applicants and incorporate veteran workforce analyses into future EEO Plans.

DISTRICT STRATEGIES TO MITIGATE IDENTIFIED ADVERSE IMPACT

When adverse impact is identified in its longitudinal analysis through the District's EEO monitoring and analysis processes, prompt corrective action may be necessary to ensure equitable employment practices. If the EEO Officer determines that a selection technique, procedure, or practice has resulted in an adverse impact on a monitored group, the EEO Officer shall notify the Superintendent/President and provide appropriate recommendations. Upon review, the Superintendent/President may take corrective action, including reopening the recruitment process, as appropriate.

When the District identifies an adverse impact in its longitudinal analysis, the District shall take the following steps:

1. Review the longitudinal hiring process analyses results for potential adverse impact affecting the identified monitored group at any phase(s) of the hiring process or employment.
2. Conduct additional quantitative analyses of phases where the District identifies adverse impact to determine, where possible, the specific elements of the hiring process or employment stage creating an adverse impact.
3. Identify the root causes of any disparities uncovered in the data. This may involve conducting surveys, interviews, or focus groups with applicants or employees to gain insights.
4. Based on the analysis and root cause identification, develop actionable recommendations to address disparities and promote EEO programs.
5. Review the identified hiring process elements or employment stage contributing to the adverse impact to determine whether they can be modified, eliminated, or replaced with a procedure that can decrease the adverse impact.
6. Consider the implementation of additional measures designed to promote diversity in the hiring process and employment.
7. Analyze retention of monitored group employees in the impacted area and other employment processes that impact the District's ability to attract and retain a diverse.
8. Present the findings to the EEOAC, and other relevant stakeholder groups to identify other potential good faith efforts to make positive progress towards eliminating the adverse impact.

Plan Component 11: A Process for utilizing Data to Determine Whether Monitored Groups are Underrepresented

Within District Job Categories

References: CCR, Title 5, §§53003(c)(9), and 53006

In conjunction with EEO Data gathered pursuant to EEO Plan Component 10, the District shall identify and utilize data available from reliable public and private sources to determine whether monitored groups are underrepresented within District job categories, as defined in EEO Plan Component 2.

DATA COLLECTION

The District shall utilize data available from reliable public and private sources, including but not limited to Student population, local, state and national for this analysis.

ANALYSIS TO IDENTIFY UNDERREPRESENTATION

Once the District gathers the EEO Data described in Component 10 and the data from public and private sources described in this EEO Plan Component, and assigns every employee and applicant to one of the seven job categories identified in EEO Plan Component 2, the District will then review the EEO Data of its employees, broken down by number of persons from monitored group status in each job category. The District will then analyze this employee EEO Data to compare the percent of a monitored group in a job category with their projected representation based on availability in the workforce. Representation below 80% constitutes underrepresentation.

Applicant and hiring data was obtained from a local Human Resources report which includes data from the last three years (application date ranges from 2022 – 2026). Hiring rate is defined as the number of hires divided by the number of applicants within a certain demographic group. For each analysis, the demographic group with the greatest hiring rate was identified as the reference group- that rate was used as the expected probability. A demographic group had a 'disparity' in actual vs. expected hire rate if the difference in rates was statistically significant at $p < .023$ using a left tailed Z test, or if the two-tailed Binomial Exact probability times two $< .05$. In instances where the highest group hire rate is 100%, the Z-score is impossible to calculate due to attempting to divide by zero. Monitored groups that are not statistically significant but have a Z-score of less than -1.5 are highlighted.

Because some employees did not report race/ethnicity, percentages for reported demographic groups are calculated only among employees with known race/ethnicity and may appear larger than they would if unknown responses were included.

Binomial Exact values less than 0.05 and Standard Deviation (SD) greater than 2.0 indicate a confidence level of 95% or greater and the difference is not due to random distribution. **See Appendix A: EEO Analysis Summary Report.**

Plan Component 12: Methods to Address Any Underrepresentation

References: CCR, Title 5, §53003(c)(10)

Title 5, Section 53003(c)(10) requires the EEO Plan to identify strategies for addressing any underrepresentation identified pursuant to Section 53003(c)(9) and EEO Plan Component 11. The EEO Officer is responsible for developing appropriate measures for addressing findings of underrepresentation.

The District will review the information gathered pursuant to EEO Plan Component 11 to determine if underrepresentation of a monitored group may be the result of non-job-related factors in the employment process. The information to be reviewed shall include, but need not be limited to:

1. Relevant data gathered pursuant to EEO Plan Component 10, to identify whether the percentage of persons from a monitored group employed by the District in a job category is below eighty percent (80%) of the projected representation for that group and job category; and
2. Analysis of data regarding applicants, which may inform the District's analysis of underrepresentation of a monitored group.

The District's EEO Analysis Report identified Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Female employees as underrepresented monitored groups, based on statistically significant disparities in pass rates within one or more employment processes (see Appendix A). Consistent with its commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA), the District recognizes the importance of implementing equitable recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention practices that expand access to employment opportunities and support a diverse and inclusive workforce. Efforts to improve representation and equitable employment outcomes for underrepresented monitored groups further the objectives of federal and state EEO laws, promote workforce diversity, and help ensure that employment opportunities are accessible and equitable for all qualified individuals.

The District will regularly review workforce and hiring data to assess progress toward achieving EEO Plan objectives and improving representation among underrepresented monitored groups. Where analyses identify persistent disparities or indicate that established objectives are not being met, the District will consult with the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Council (EEOAC) to recommend corrective actions, enhanced strategies, or modifications to the EEO Plan, as appropriate, to advance equal employment opportunity and equitable outcomes.

In order to address these instances of underrepresentation, as defined above, the District will implement any of the following measures:

1. The District will request that the EEOAC, in conjunction with appropriate Human Resources staff, review the District's recruitment procedures and make recommendations on modifications that would address the underrepresentation.

2. The District will require the responsible administrator for the division or department where the underrepresentation occurs, in conjunction with the EEO officer, to create a recruitment and hiring action plan to assist in addressing the underrepresentation. The action plan will include, but is not limited to:
 - a. Participation in outreach activities that would likely attract applicants from the underrepresented groups, such as participating in diversity job fairs (*e.g.*, California Community Colleges Registry Diversity Job Fairs, California Career Exploration Fairs hosted by COM's Transfer and Career Center) and building relationships with graduate programs and other institutions.
 - b. Additional locations or resources to advertise positions (*e.g.*, on the District employment website, the California Community College Equal Employment Opportunity Registry, and to a list of appropriate external "bulletin board" websites);
 - c. Review the use of any locally established minimum qualification and/or "desired" or "preferred" qualifications to determine if they are job-related and consistent with business necessity in compliance with federal and state laws.
 - d. Review job descriptions to eliminate biased language and requirements and update focusing on skills and qualifications required for the position.
 - e. Discontinue the use of any locally established minimum qualification and/or "desired" or "preferred" qualification that is found to not satisfy the requirements set forth above.
 - f. Include the District Board Policy Commitment to Diversity in job postings and on the careers opportunities website.
 - g. Consider changes to the job postings and screening criteria, including interview questions and how reference checks are conducted, which may reasonably be expected to attract applicants from underrepresented groups. For example, interviews must include at least two questions which assess the candidate's understanding of and commitment to equal employment opportunity and their sensitivity to, and understanding of, the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.
 - h. The District may implement additional recruitment, hiring, retention, professional development, and workforce equity strategies as warranted by ongoing EEO analyses, workforce data, identified barriers to equal employment opportunity, emerging best practices, and changes in applicable laws, regulations, or guidance. Such strategies may be developed and modified as necessary to improve representation, promote equitable employment outcomes, and further the goals and objectives of this EEO Plan.

The District will monitor the effectiveness of these efforts through ongoing workforce and hiring analyses and will make adjustments as necessary to advance the objectives of this EEO Plan and promote equitable employment opportunities for all applicants and employees. The District will evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies through periodic analysis of applicant, hiring, promotion, retention, and workforce demographic data; assessment of recruitment and outreach activities; adverse impact analyses; and review of progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of this EEO Plan. Findings will be used to identify barriers, inform corrective actions, and guide continuous improvement of the District's EEO efforts.

Plan Component 13: Additional Measures and Methods to Support Equal Employment Opportunity Initiatives

References: CCR, Title 5, §§53003(c)(1), 53003(c)(2), and 53024.1

The District recognizes that establishing and maintaining a richly diverse workforce is an on-going process that requires continued effort. It further recognizes that it is responsible for developing and implementing EEO strategies. The EEO strategies that the District will implement throughout the life of the EEO Plan are identified in Appendix B.

Appendix A

EEO Analysis Summary Report

Prepared by the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the College of Marin's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) analyses conducted to evaluate workforce representation and hiring practices. The analyses include an Availability Analysis, a Longitudinal Hiring analysis, and a Longitudinal Hiring Phase Analysis of the hiring process. Together, these assessments provide information regarding the demographic composition of the College's workforce, the representation of monitored groups relative to expected availability, and hiring outcomes across applicant groups. The purpose of these analyses is to identify potential barriers to equal employment opportunity, support compliance with applicable EEO requirements, and inform strategies to promote equitable recruitment and hiring practices.

The Availability Analysis indicated that some target demographics are underutilized in specific job classifications. Asian employees are underutilized in the faculty job classification. Female employees are underutilized in the service maintenance classification. Hispanic/Latino employees are underutilized in the faculty classification. Additionally, the analysis showed White and Male workers as underutilized in specific job classifications; however, those are not monitored groups.

The Longitudinal Hiring Analysis concluded that Asian applicants were hired less than expected in technical paraprofessional and clerical/secretarial classifications. In some instances, White and Male workers were labeled as having a disparity between actual vs. expected hiring rates, but those are not monitored groups.

The Longitudinal Hiring Phase Analysis concluded that across job classifications, statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates were identified for several demographic groups at various stages of the hiring process. The most frequent findings involved Asian, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino applicants, with disparities appearing in both early-stage screening activities, such as Application Received, Minimum Qualification Screening, and Committee Screening, and later-stage hiring decisions, such as Interview Pending, Interview, 2nd Interview, and the Offering stages. Female applicants were also identified in several classifications, specifically the Minimum Qualification Screening, Interview Pending, 2nd Interview, and Offering stages.

Additionally, a [matrix table](#) was developed to support findings across each phase of the Hiring Phase Analysis for all job classifications. Asian applicants had at least a marginally statistically significant disparity at the Application Received phase across every classification. Hispanic/Latino applicants achieved the highest pass rates in all but one classification during the Interview Pending phase; however, they experienced at least a marginally statistically significant disparity in all but one classification during the subsequent Interview phase. White applicants demonstrated a statistically significant disparity during the Second Interview phase in all but one classification.

Disability and Veteran Data and Reporting

The District collects disability status data for both employees and applicants. However, limitations within the District's current Enterprise Resource Planning system have restricted its ability to extract, analyze, and report this data in a manner that ensures accuracy, consistency, and reliability. The District is actively exploring solutions to enhance reporting capabilities and data integrity. As these capabilities are developed and validated, the District intends to incorporate longitudinal disability analyses into future EEO Plans to support ongoing evaluation of workforce representation and employment practices.

Consistent with applicable Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) regulations and reporting requirements, the District will collect, analyze and report veteran status data from both employees and applicants and incorporate veteran workforce analyses into future EEO Plans.

Availability Analysis

Introduction

The EEO Availability Analysis evaluates the extent to which College of Marin's workforce reflects the diversity of the qualified labor market from which employees may reasonably be recruited. This analysis compares the demographic composition of College of Marin's current workforce within specific employee classifications against the estimated availability of qualified individuals in the relevant composite labor market. By identifying areas where representation differs from workforce availability, the analysis helps the College assess progress toward its equal employment opportunity goals, identify opportunities to strengthen equitable hiring, and retain a workforce that reflects a broad range of demographics.

The analysis is intended to assess whether current employment practices are producing workforce outcomes that align with estimated availability. Observed differences may be influenced by factors such as applicant pool size, position-specific qualifications, recruitment activity, or other employment considerations. Where notable differences in hiring rates are identified, the College may conduct additional reviews to determine whether barriers exist and whether corrective actions or enhanced outreach strategies should be considered as part of its EEO plan.

Method

College of Marin's student and employee demographic composition for race/ethnicity and gender were obtained from the CCCC DataMart. The Classified employee categories were obtained separately from the College's internal Enterprise Reporting System. Local workforce availability was estimated using U.S. Census EEO job classification tables for Marin, Sonoma, and Contra Costa counties. The same Census tables for California and the United States were used to produce the statewide and nationwide workforce availability estimates, respectively. Composite availability was calculated and estimated by weighing the local workforce availability at 50%, the student demographic composition at 40%, and the statewide and nationwide workforces each weighed at 5%. This composition was determined as the most appropriate representation of the College's available labor market.

The composite availability estimate was compared with the College's workforce demographic composition to conduct the utilization analysis. A left-tailed Z-test was used to evaluate whether differences between the actual and expected representation of each monitored group were statistically significant.

A monitored group was considered underutilized if its workforce representation was less than 80 percent of its estimated availability and the difference between the actual and expected values was statistically significant at $p < .023$. Monitored groups with Z-scores between -1.50 and -1.99 that did not meet the threshold for statistical significance are also identified as areas that may warrant monitoring.

Because some employees did not report race/ethnicity, percentages for reported demographic groups are calculated only among employees with known race/ethnicity and may appear larger than they would if unknown responses were included.

In addition, employees who report multiple race/ethnicity categories or a non-binary gender are excluded from the analysis because there are no corresponding categories in the U.S. Census data used to estimate availability. As a result, comparable availability estimates cannot be calculated for these groups.

The sum of all rows in **Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees** might not equal total in **Total Job Group Employees**. Race/ethnicities left out of Table 1 include those with multiple ethnicities, and those with an unknown ethnicity.

Certain demographics in this analysis are historically underrepresented groups.

Underrepresented groups:					
Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	Female
An underrepresented group is a monitored group if it is underutilized.					

An analysis of the faculty workforce shows some differences between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability.

Hispanic/Latino faculty make up 12.8% of the workforce, yet were expected to make up 24.3%, a negative difference of 11.5 percentage points and a statistically significant difference. **Asian faculty** make up 4.5% of the workforce, yet were expected to make up 10.0%, a negative difference of 5.5 percentage points and a statistically significant difference.

Job Group: Faculty

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Faculty	288	171	59.4%	57.7%	166	0.73	0.56	-5	Underutilized Underutilized
Black/ African American	Faculty	288	19	6.6%	2.9%	8	1.00	3.80	-11	
Hispanic/ Latino	Faculty	288	37	12.8%	24.3%	70	0.00	-4.54	33	
Asian	Faculty	288	13	4.5%	10.0%	29	0.00	-3.12	16	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Faculty	288	3	1.0%	0.1%	0	1.00	4.91	-3	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Faculty	288	0	0.0%	0.1%	0	0.77	-0.51	0	
Total Monitored	Faculty	288	117	40.6%	42.3%	122	0.31	-0.56	5	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Faculty	288	160	55.6%	55.8%	161	0.49	-0.09	1	
Males	Faculty	288	124	43.1%	42.9%	124	0.55	0.06	0	

An analysis of the administrative/managerial workforce shows little to no difference between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability.

Job Group: Administrative/Managerial

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Administrative/Managerial	29	12	41.4%	56.3%	16	0.08	-1.62	4	
Black/ African American	Administrative/Managerial	29	3	10.3%	6.4%	2	0.89	0.88	-1	
Hispanic/ Latino	Administrative/Managerial	29	5	17.2%	26.7%	8	0.17	-1.15	3	
Asian	Administrative/Managerial	29	1	3.4%	5.1%	1	0.56	-0.40	0	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Administrative/Managerial	29	1	3.4%	0.1%	0	1.00	5.18	-1	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Administrative/Managerial	29	0	0.0%	0.6%	0	0.84	-0.42	0	
Total Monitored	Administrative/Managerial	29	17	58.6%	43.7%	13	0.96	1.62	-4	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Administrative/Managerial	29	18	62.1%	64.6%	19	0.46	-0.29	1	
Males	Administrative/Managerial	29	9	31.0%	34.1%	10	0.45	-0.35	1	

An analysis of the service/maintenance workforce shows some differences between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability. **Female service/maintenance** employees make up 28.2% of the workforce, yet were expected to make up 48.5%, a negative difference of 20.3 percentage points and a statistically significant difference. There is an observed difference between the actual and expected number of Black/African American employees; however, the difference is not statistically significant.

Job Group: Classified – Service Maintenance

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Service / Maintenance	39	13	33.3%	36.5%	14	0.41	-0.40	1	
Black/ African American	Service / Maintenance	39	0	0.0%	6.0%	2	0.09	-1.57	2	
Hispanic/ Latino	Service / Maintenance	39	22	56.4%	44.1%	17	0.96	1.55	-5	
Asian	Service / Maintenance	39	3	7.7%	7.8%	3	0.64	-0.02	0	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Service / Maintenance	39	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.91	-0.30	0	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Service / Maintenance	39	0	0.0%	0.4%	0	0.85	-0.40	0	
Total Monitored	Service / Maintenance	39	26	66.7%	63.6%	25	0.71	0.40	-1	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Service / Maintenance	39	11	28.2%	48.5%	19	0.01	-2.54	8	Underutilized
Males	Service / Maintenance	39	28	71.8%	50.2%	20	1.00	2.70	-8	

An analysis of the skilled crafts workforce shows little to no difference between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability. However, the group size is not large enough to justify any statistical conclusion.

Job Group: Classified – Skilled Crafts

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Skilled Crafts	6	2	33.3%	43.9%	3	0.46	-0.52	1	
Black/ African American	Skilled Crafts	6	0	0.0%	3.7%	0	0.80	-0.48	0	
Hispanic/ Latino	Skilled Crafts	6	3	50.0%	41.8%	3	0.80	0.41	0	
Asian	Skilled Crafts	6	0	0.0%	5.4%	0	0.72	-0.59	0	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Skilled Crafts	6	0	0.0%	0.3%	0	0.98	-0.13	0	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Skilled Crafts	6	0	0.0%	0.3%	0	0.98	-0.14	0	
Total Monitored	Skilled Crafts	6	4	66.7%	56.1%	3	0.82	0.52	-1	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Skilled Crafts	6	0	0.0%	25.1%	2	0.18	-1.42	2	
Males	Skilled Crafts	6	5	83.3%	73.7%	4	0.84	0.54	-1	

An analysis of the technical paraprofessional workforce shows little to no difference between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability. There is an observed difference between the actual and expected number of Hispanic/Latino employees; however, the difference is not statistically significant

Job Group: Classified – Tech Paraprofessional

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Tech Paraprofessional	106	49	46.2%	44.7%	47	0.66	0.31	-2	
Black/ African American	Tech Paraprofessional	106	5	4.7%	5.8%	6	0.41	-0.50	1	
Hispanic/ Latino	Tech Paraprofessional	106	27	25.5%	32.4%	34	0.08	-1.52	7	
Asian	Tech Paraprofessional	106	14	13.2%	11.6%	12	0.76	0.53	-2	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Tech Paraprofessional	106	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.79	-0.49	0	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Tech Paraprofessional	106	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.84	-0.42	0	
Total Monitored	Tech Paraprofessional	106	57	53.8%	55.3%	59	0.41	-0.31	2	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Tech Paraprofessional	106	60	56.6%	61.2%	65	0.19	-0.98	5	
Males	Tech Paraprofessional	106	45	42.5%	37.5%	40	0.88	1.06	-5	

An analysis of the clerical / secretarial workforce shows little to no difference between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability. There is an observed difference between the actual and expected number of Hispanic/Latino employees; however, the difference is not statistically significant. Though the analysis shows a statistically significant difference in actual vs. expected male employees, males are not a monitored demographic group.

Job Group: Classified – Clerical / Secretarial

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Clerical / Secretarial	29	13	44.8%	46.0%	13	0.53	-0.13	0	
Black/ African American	Clerical / Secretarial	29	2	6.9%	6.3%	2	0.73	0.13	0	
Hispanic/ Latino	Clerical / Secretarial	29	5	17.2%	32.4%	9	0.06	-1.74	4	
Asian	Clerical / Secretarial	29	3	10.3%	9.6%	3	0.70	0.13	0	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Clerical / Secretarial	29	0	0.0%	0.3%	0	0.92	-0.28	0	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Clerical / Secretarial	29	1	3.4%	0.4%	0	0.99	2.75	-1	
Total Monitored	Clerical / Secretarial	29	16	55.2%	54.0%	16	0.62	0.13	0	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Clerical / Secretarial	29	27	93.1%	66.4%	19	1.00	3.05	-8	Underutilized
Males	Clerical / Secretarial	29	2	6.9%	32.4%	9	0.00	-2.93	7	

An analysis of the professional non-faculty workforce shows little to no difference between workforce composition by selected demographic and estimated availability.

Job Group: Classified – Professional Non-Faculty

Table 1: Underutilization Analysis by Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Race/ethnicity Job Group Employees	% of Race/Ethnicity Job Group Employees	Race/ethnicity Availability	Race/ethnicity Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
White	Prof non-faculty	10	5	50.0%	53.4%	5	0.54	-0.21	0	
Black/ African American	Prof non-faculty	10	0	0.0%	4.1%	0	0.66	-0.66	0	
Hispanic/ Latino	Prof non-faculty	10	1	10.0%	25.4%	3	0.24	-1.12	2	
Asian	Prof non-faculty	10	2	20.0%	11.9%	1	0.89	0.80	-1	
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Prof non-faculty	10	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.98	-0.13	0	
Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	Prof non-faculty	10	0	0.0%	0.3%	0	0.98	-0.16	0	
Total Monitored	Prof non-faculty	10	5	50.0%	46.6%	5	0.70	0.21	0	

Table 2: Underutilization Analysis by Gender

Gender	Job Group	Total Job Group Employees	Total Gender Job Group Employees	% of Gender Job Group Employees	Gender Availability	Gender Expected based on Availability	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	Underutilization
Females	Prof non-faculty	10	5	50.0%	53.6%	5	0.53	-0.23	0	
Males	Prof non-faculty	10	4	40.0%	45.1%	5	0.50	-0.33	1	

Longitudinal Hiring Analysis

Introduction

The EEO Longitudinal Hiring Analysis evaluates applicant and hiring outcomes to assess whether selection rates differ among monitored demographic groups. The analysis compares hiring rates across race/ethnicity and gender to identify differences in hiring outcomes and determine whether any group has a disproportionately lower selection rate than other applicants.

The analysis is intended to assess whether current hiring practices are producing equitable hiring outcomes. Observed differences may be influenced by factors such as applicant pool size, position-specific qualifications, recruitment activity, or other employment considerations. Where notable differences in hiring rates are identified, the College may conduct additional reviews to determine whether barriers exist and whether corrective actions or enhanced outreach strategies should be considered as part of its EEO plan.

Method

College of Marin’s applicant and hiring data was obtained from a local Human Resources report which includes data from the last three years (application date ranges from 2022 – 2026). Hiring rate is defined as the number of hires divided by the number of applicants within a certain demographic group. For each analysis, the demographic group with the greatest hiring rate was identified as the reference group- that rate was used as the expected probability. A demographic group had a ‘disparity’ in actual vs. expected hire rate if the difference in rates was statistically significant at $p < .023$ using a left tailed Z test, or if the two-tailed Binomial Exact probability times two $< .05$. In instances where the highest group hire rate is 100%, the Z-score is impossible to calculate due to attempting to divide by zero. Monitored groups that are not statistically significant but have a Z-score of less than -1.5 are highlighted.

Because some employees did not report race/ethnicity, percentages for reported demographic groups are calculated only among employees with known race/ethnicity and may appear larger than they would if unknown responses were included.

Binomial Exact values less than 0.05 and Standard Deviation (SD) greater than 2.0 indicate a confidence level of 95% or greater and the difference is not due to random distribution.

Underrepresented groups:				
Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Female
An underrepresented group is a monitored group if it has a statistically significant disparity in pass rates.				

The longitudinal analysis of faculty hiring indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by race/ethnicity. Though a statistically significant disparity was noted for male applicants, they are not a monitored group.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Faculty

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	807	413	32	51.2%	7.7%	34	0.37	-0.43	2		
Black/African American	807	72	3	8.9%	4.2%	6	0.14	-1.28	3		
Hispanic/Latino	807	169	10	20.9%	5.9%	14	0.16	-1.14	4		
Asian	807	144	12	17.8%	8.3%	12	0.58	0.00	0		
American Indian/Alaska Native	807	9	1	1.1%	11.1%	1	0.83	0.30	0		

Note: American Indian/Alaska Native hire rate not counted as the best hire rate due to group size (<2% of total population).

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	949	403	46	42.5%	11.4%	46	0.54	0.00	0		
Male	949	532	16	56.1%	3.0%	61	0.00	-6.10	45	YES	YES
Non-Binary	949	14	0	1.5%	0.0%	2	0.18	-1.34	2		

The longitudinal analysis of administrative/managerial hiring indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by race/ethnicity. Though a statistically significant difference was noted for male applicants, they are not a monitored group.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Administrative/Managerial

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	292	132	7	45.2%	5.3%	7	0.55	-0.13	0		
Black/African American	292	51	1	17.5%	2.0%	3	0.22	-1.12	2		
Hispanic/Latino	292	54	3	18.5%	5.6%	3	0.65	0.00	0		
Asian	292	50	1	17.1%	2.0%	3	0.23	-1.10	2		
American Indian/Alaska Native	292	5	0	1.7%	0.0%	0	0.75	-0.54	0		

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	332	128	9	38.6%	7.0%	9	0.59	0.00	0		
Male	332	202	4	60.8%	2.0%	14	0.00	-2.81	10	YES	YES
Non-Binary	332	2	0	0.6%	0.0%	0	0.86	-0.39	0		

The longitudinal analysis of service maintenance hiring indicates no statistically significant difference in hiring rates by race/ethnicity. There is an observed difference between the actual and expected hiring rates for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino applicants; however, the difference is not statistically significant. The analysis indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by gender.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified – Service Maintenance

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	113	29	6	25.7%	20.7%	6	0.61	0.00	0		
Black/African American	113	10	0	8.8%	0.0%	2	0.10	-1.62	2		
Hispanic/Latino	113	63	8	55.8%	12.7%	13	0.07	-1.57	5		
Asian	113	9	1	8.0%	11.1%	2	0.42	-0.71	1		
American Indian/Alaska Native	113	2	0	1.8%	0.0%	0	0.63	-0.72	0		

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	140	37	2	26.4%	5.4%	5	0.10	-1.45	3		
Male	140	103	14	73.6%	13.6%	14	0.57	0.00	0		
Non-Binary	140	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	1.00	0.00	0		

The longitudinal analysis of skilled craft hiring indicates a statistically significant difference in hiring rates for White applicants; however, they are not a monitored group. The analysis indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by gender.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified – Skilled Crafts

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	21	9	1	42.9%	11.1%	5	0.02	-2.33	4	YES	YES
Black/African American	21	2	0	9.5%	0.0%	1	0.25	-1.41	1		
Hispanic/Latino	21	2	1	9.5%	50.0%	1	0.75	0.00	0		
Asian	21	8	2	38.1%	25.0%	4	0.14	-1.41	2		
American Indian/Alaska Native	21	0	0	0.0%	0%	0	1.00	0.00	0		

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	25	2	0	8.0%	0.0%	0	0.68	-0.65	0		
Male	25	23	4	92.0%	17.4%	4	0.63	0.00	0		
Non-Binary	25	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	1.00	0.00	0		

The longitudinal analysis of hiring for technical paraprofessional positions indicates a statistically significant difference in hiring rates for **Asian** applicants. This difference was **statistically significant** based on the binomial exact test. The analysis indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by gender. The gender demo group hire rate used was female, as the non-binary group size was insufficient.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified – Technical Paraprofessional

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	466	188	13	40.3%	6.9%	17	0.18	-1.04	4		
Black/African American	466	22	2	4.7%	9.1%	2	0.68	0.00	0		
Hispanic/Latino	466	97	8	20.8%	8.2%	9	0.47	-0.29	1		
Asian	466	155	7	33.3%	4.5%	14	0.02	-1.98	7		YES
American Indian/Alaska Native	466	4	0	0.9%	0.0%	0	0.68	-0.63	0		

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	541	309	22	57.1%	7.1%	22	0.56	0.01	0		
Male	541	226	13	41.8%	5.8%	16	0.26	-0.79	3		
Non-Binary	541	6	1	1.1%	16.7%	0	0.94	0.91	-1		

The longitudinal analysis of hiring for clerical/secretarial positions indicates statistically significant differences in hiring rates for **Asian** and **White** applicants; however, White applicants are not a monitored group. The analysis indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by gender.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified – Clerical / Secretarial

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	162	77	2	47.5%	2.6%	12	0.00	-3.11	10	YES	YES
Black/African American	162	13	2	8.0%	15.4%	2	0.68	0.00	0		
Hispanic/Latino	162	45	4	27.8%	8.9%	7	0.16	-1.21	3		
Asian	162	26	0	16.0%	0.0%	4	0.01	-2.17	4	YES	YES
American Indian/Alaska Native	162	1	0	0.6%	0.0%	0	0.85	-0.43	0		

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	200	155	9	77.5%	5.8%	9	0.59	0.00	0		
Male	200	44	1	22.0%	2.3%	3	0.27	-1.00	2		
Non-Binary	200	1	0	0.5%	0.0%	0	0.94	-0.25	0		

The longitudinal analysis of professional non-faculty hiring indicates no statistically significant difference in hiring rates by race/ethnicity. There is an observed difference between the actual and expected hiring rates for Asian applicants; however, the difference is not statistically significant. The analysis indicates little to no difference in hiring rates by gender.

Longitudinal Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified – Professional Non-Faculty

Race/Ethnicity	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
White	46	23	1	50.0%	4.3%	4	0.08	-1.59	3		
Black/African American	46	4	0	8.7%	0.0%	1	0.48	-0.89	1		
Hispanic/Latino	46	6	1	13.0%	16.7%	1	0.74	0.00	0		
Asian	46	13	0	28.3%	0.0%	2	0.09	-1.61	2		
American Indian/Alaska Native	46	0	0	0.0%	0%	0	1.00	0.00	0		

Longitudinal Analysis - Gender

Gender	Total Applicants	Total Demo Group Applicants	Total Demo Group Hired	Demo Group App %	Demo Group Hire Rate	Demo Group Hire Expected based on App Rate	Binomial Exact	SD	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Female	57	43	2	75.4%	4.7%	2	0.68	0.00	0		
Male	57	14	0	24.6%	0.0%	1	0.51	-0.83	1		
Non-Binary	57	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	1.00	0.00	0		

Phase Analysis

Introduction

The EEO Longitudinal Hiring Phase Analysis evaluates the hiring process at different steps to identify potential disparities in selection rates among monitored demographic groups. The analysis compares the rates of applicants across race/ethnicity and gender to determine whether any group experiences disproportionately lower rates in advancing throughout the hiring process.

The analysis is intended to identify differences in hiring outcomes among demographic groups and to evaluate the outcomes of the College's recruitment and selection practices. Observed differences may be influenced by factors such as applicant pool size, position-specific qualifications, recruitment activity, or other employment considerations. Where notable differences in hiring rates are identified, the College may conduct additional reviews to determine whether barriers exist and whether corrective actions or enhanced outreach strategies should be considered as part of its EEO plan.

Method

College of Marin's applicant and hiring data was obtained from the College's data enterprise system. Data in this analysis includes positions hired from 2023-2024 through 2025-2026. Demographic groups with less than 2% representation in the total population were excluded in the subgroup analyses but were included in the total counts.

Pass rate is defined as the number of applicants in any given hiring phase who advanced to the next step in the hiring process. For each phase, the demographic group with the greatest pass rate was identified as the reference group, and that rate was used as the expected pass rate. A demographic group had a 'disparity' in actual vs. expected pass rate if the difference in rates was statistically significant at $p < .023$ using a left tailed Z test, or if the binomial exact probability times two is $< .05$. In instances where the highest group pass percentage is 100%, the Z-score is impossible to calculate due to attempting to divide by zero.

The 80% calculation is defined as a monitored group's pass rate divided by the reference group's pass rate. If the resulting proportion is less than 80%, the group may be considered underrepresented. The rule serves as a useful screening tool and an easily understandable method of assessing adverse impact. The 80% rule does not imply statistical significance. Monitored groups with Z-scores between -1.50 and -1.99 that did not meet the threshold for statistical significance are also identified as areas that may warrant monitoring.

The 80% rule and statistical significance test provide complementary perspectives and are analyzed separately. When the results do not align, conclusions defer to results with statistical significance.

Because some employees did not report race/ethnicity, percentages for reported demographic groups are calculated only among employees with known race/ethnicity and may appear larger than they would if unknown responses were included.

In some job classifications, group sizes at the later stages of the hiring process are small enough to drastically alter statistical outcomes if they have the highest pass rate. Examples of this instance include Asian applicants, **Offered** phase, Service/Maintenance section, and Black/African American applicants, **Interview phase onward**, Technical Paraprofessional section.

Faculty

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received** and **Interview** phases of the hiring process. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Minimum Qualification Screening** and **2nd Interview** phases. Hispanic/Latino applicants had a statistically significant difference for the **Second Interview** phase.

Additionally, Black/African American applicants have an observed difference between expected and actual pass rates for the **Interview Pending** and **Offered** phases. Hispanic/Latino applicants have an observed difference for the **Minimum Qualification Screening**, **Committee Screening**, **Interview**, and **Offered**. Female applicants have an observed difference for the **Offered** phase, but the difference was not statistically significant.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants and male applicants, these groups are not monitored groups.

The 80% Rule analysis identified differences in pass rates that were not detected by the statistical significance tests. Specifically, differences were identified for Hispanic/Latino applicants for the **Committee Screening** and **Interview** phases, and for Black/African American applicants for the **Offered** phase.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Faculty

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian
Application Received	413	72	169	144	88.9%	90.3%	87.0%	77.8%	Black/African American	98.4%	100%	96.3%	86.2%
Minimum Qualification Screening	367	65	147	112	82.3%	66.2%	83.0%	87.5%	Asian	94.0%	75.6%	94.8%	100%
Committee Screening	302	43	122	98	43.4%	44.2%	35.2%	40.8%	Black/African American	98.2%	100%	79.8%	92.4%
Interview Pending	131	19	43	40	80.2%	73.7%	86.0%	80.0%	Hispanic/Latino	93.2%	85.6%	100%	93.0%
Interview	105	14	37	32	51.4%	64.3%	51.4%	43.8%	Black/African American	80.0%	100%	79.9%	68.1%
2nd Interview	54	9	19	14	64.8%	44.4%	63.2%	92.9%	Asian	69.8%	47.9%	68.0%	100%
Recommended for Hire	35	4	12	13	97.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Black/African American	97.1%	100%	100%	100%
Offered	34	4	12	13	94.1%	75.0%	83.3%	92.3%	White	100%	79.7%	88.5%	98.1%

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Faculty

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	807	Black/African American	90.3%	Asian	144	77.8%	130	112	0.00	-5.06	18	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	169	87.0%	153	147	0.10	-1.45	6		
				White	413	88.9%	373	367	0.19	-0.97	6		
Minimum Qualification Screening	699	Asian	87.5%	Black/African American	65	66.2%	57	43	0.00	-5.20	14	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	147	83.0%	129	122	0.07	-1.65	7		
				White	367	82.3%	321	302	0.00	-3.02	19		
Committee Screening	571	Black/African American	44.2%	Asian	98	40.8%	43	40	0.29	-0.67	3		
				Hispanic/Latino	122	35.2%	54	43	0.03	-1.99	11		
				White	302	43.4%	133	131	0.41	-0.28	2		
Interview Pending	238	Hispanic/Latino	86.0%	Asian	40	80.0%	34	32	0.19	-1.10	2		
				Black/African American	19	73.7%	16	14	0.11	-1.56	2		
				White	131	80.2%	113	105	0.04	-1.95	8		
Interview	192	Black/African American	64.3%	Asian	32	43.8%	21	14	0.01	-2.42	7	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	37	51.4%	24	19	0.07	-1.64	5		
				White	105	51.4%	68	54	0.00	-2.75	14		
2nd Interview	98	Asian	92.9%	Black/African American	9	44.4%	8	4	0.00	-5.64	4	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	19	63.2%	18	12	0.00	-5.03	6		
				White	54	64.8%	50	35	0.00	-8.00	15		
Recommended for Hire	66	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	13	100.0%	13	13	1.00		0		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	12	100.0%	12	12	1.00		0		
				White	35	97.1%	35	34	0.00		1		
Offered	64	White	94.1%	Asian	13	92.3%	12	12	0.55	-0.28	0		
				Black/African American	4	75.0%	4	3	0.22	-1.63	1		
				Hispanic/Latino	12	83.3%	11	10	0.15	-1.59	1		

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Faculty

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
Application Received	403	532	86.4%	87.4%	Male	98.8%
Minimum Qualification Screening	348	465	83.3%	81.3%	Female	97.5%
Committee Screening	290	378	52.1%	32.0%	Female	61.5%
Interview Pending	151	121	82.8%	81.0%	Female	97.8%
Interview	125	98	59.2%	30.6%	Female	51.7%
2nd Interview	74	30	71.6%	60.0%	Female	83.8%
Recommended for Hire	53	18	98.1%	94.4%	Female	96.3%
Offered	52	17	88.5%	94.1%	Male	94.0%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Faculty

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	949	Male	87.4%	Female	403	86.4%	352	348	0.28	-0.64	4		
Minimum Qualification Screening	826	Female	83.3%	Male	465	81.3%	388	378	0.13	-1.18	10		
Committee Screening	677	Female	52.1%	Male	378	32.0%	197	121	0.00	-7.81	76	YES	YES
Interview Pending	277	Female	82.8%	Male	121	81.0%	100	98	0.34	-0.52	2		
Interview	227	Female	59.2%	Male	98	30.6%	58	30	0.00	-5.76	28	YES	YES
2nd Interview	106	Female	71.6%	Male	30	60.0%	21	18	0.12	-1.41	3		
Recommended for Hire	71	Female	98.1%	Male	18	94.4%	18	17	0.29	-1.14	1		
Offered	69	Male	94.1%	Female	52	88.5%	49	46	0.08	-1.73	3		

Administrative/Managerial

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received**, **Interview Pending** and **Interview** phases of the hiring process. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Committee Screening** and **Interview Pending** phases. Hispanic/Latino applicants had a statistically significant difference for the **Recommended for Hire** phase. Female applicants had a statistically significant difference for the **Minimum Qualification Screening** phase.

Additionally, Black/African American applicants had an observed difference between expected and actual pass rates for the **2nd Interview** phase, but the difference was not statistically significant.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants and male applicants, these groups are not monitored groups.

The 80% Rule analysis identified differences in pass rates that were not detected by the statistical significance tests. Specifically, differences were identified for Asian applicants for the **2nd Interview** phase, Hispanic/Latino applicants for the **Interview** phase, Black/African American applicants for the **Interview** and **2nd Interview** phases.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Administrative/Managerial

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian
Application Received	132	51	54	50	87.9%	94.1%	92.6%	76.0%	Black/African American	93.4%	100%	98.4%	80.8%
Minimum Qualification Screening	116	48	50	38	87.9%	83.3%	88.0%	89.5%	Asian	98.3%	93.1%	98.4%	100%
Committee Screening	102	40	44	34	52.9%	42.5%	56.8%	61.8%	Asian	85.7%	68.8%	92.0%	100%
Interview Pending	54	17	25	21	87.0%	94.1%	100.0%	85.7%	Hispanic/Latino	87.0%	94.1%	100%	85.7%
Interview	47	16	25	18	48.9%	31.3%	36.0%	22.2%	White	100%	63.9%	73.6%	45.4%
2nd Interview	23	5	9	4	34.8%	20.0%	55.6%	25.0%	Hispanic/Latino	62.6%	36.0%	100%	45.0%
Recommended for Hire	8	1	5	1	87.5%	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	Black/African American	87.5%	100%	60.0%	100%
Offered	7	1	3	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	White	100%	100%	100%	100%

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Administrative/Managerial

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	292	Black/African American	94.1%	Asian	50	76.0%	47	38	0.00	-5.44	9	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	54	92.6%	51	50	0.39	-0.48	1		
				White	132	87.9%	124	116	0.00	-3.05	8	YES	YES
Minimum Qualification Screening	256	Asian	89.5%	Black/African American	48	83.3%	43	40	0.13	-1.39	3		
				Hispanic/Latino	50	88.0%	45	44	0.43	-0.34	1		
				White	116	87.9%	104	102	0.34	-0.54	2		
Committee Screening	224	Asian	61.8%	Black/African American	40	42.5%	25	17	0.01	-2.51	8	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	44	56.8%	27	25	0.30	-0.68	2		
				White	102	52.9%	63	54	0.04	-1.83	9		
Interview Pending	120	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	21	85.7%	21	18	0.00		3		YES
				Black/African American	17	94.1%	17	16	0.00		1		YES
				White	54	87.0%	54	47	0.00		7		YES
Interview	108	White	48.9%	Asian	18	22.2%	9	4	0.02	-2.27	5	YES	YES
				Black/African American	16	31.3%	8	5	0.12	-1.42	3		
				Hispanic/Latino	25	36.0%	12	9	0.14	-1.29	3		
2nd Interview	43	Hispanic/Latino	55.6%	Asian	4	25.0%	2	1	0.23	-1.23	1		
				Black/African American	5	20.0%	3	1	0.13	-1.60	2		
				White	23	34.8%	13	8	0.04	-2.00	5	YES	
Recommended for Hire	15	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	5	60.0%	5	3	0.00		2		YES
				White	8	87.5%	8	7	0.00		1		YES
Offered	12	White	100.0%	Asian	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	3	100.0%	3	3	1.00		0		

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Administrative/Managerial

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
Application Received	128	202	89.1%	87.6%	Female	98.4%
Minimum Qualification Screening	114	177	80.7%	90.4%	Male	89.3%
Committee Screening	92	160	53.3%	51.9%	Female	97.4%
Interview Pending	49	83	91.8%	89.2%	Female	97.1%
Interview	45	74	46.7%	40.5%	Female	86.9%
2nd Interview	21	30	47.6%	23.3%	Female	49.0%
Recommended for Hire	10	7	90.0%	71.4%	Female	79.4%
Offered	9	5	100.0%	80.0%	Female	80.0%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Administrative/Managerial

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	332	Female	89.1%	Male	202	87.6%	180	177	0.29	-0.66	3		
Minimum Qualification Screening	293	Male	90.4%	Female	114	80.7%	103	92	0.00	-3.51	11	YES	YES
Committee Screening	254	Female	53.3%	Male	160	51.9%	85	83	0.39	-0.35	2		
Interview Pending	133	Female	91.8%	Male	83	89.2%	76	74	0.24	-0.89	2		
Interview	120	Female	46.7%	Male	74	40.5%	35	30	0.17	-1.06	5		
2nd Interview	51	Female	47.6%	Male	30	23.3%	14	7	0.01	-2.66	7	YES	YES
Recommended for Hire	17	Female	90.0%	Male	7	71.4%	6	5	0.15	-1.64	1		
Offered	14	Female	100.0%	Male	5	80.0%	5	4	0.00		1		YES

Service / Maintenance

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received**, **Minimum Qualification Screening**, and **2nd Interview** phases of the hiring process. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Committee Screening** and **Interview** phases. Hispanic/Latino applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Application Received**, **Minimum Qualification Screening**, **Committee Screening**, **Interview**, **Recommended for Hire**, and **Offered** phases.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants and male applicants, these groups are not monitored groups for purposes of EEO planning.

The 80% Rule analysis identified differences in pass rates that were not detected by the statistical significance tests. Specifically, differences were identified for Black/African American applicants for the **Interview Pending** phase, and female applicants for the **Interview** phase.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified - Service Maintenance

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian
Application Received	29	10	63	9	93.1%	100.0%	82.5%	88.9%	Black/African American	93.1%	100%	82.5%	88.9%
Minimum Qualification Screening	27	10	52	8	96.3%	90.0%	90.4%	62.5%	White	100%	93.5%	93.9%	64.9%
Committee Screening	26	9	47	5	92.3%	55.6%	80.9%	80.0%	White	100%	60.2%	87.6%	86.7%
Interview Pending	24	5	38	4	75.0%	60.0%	78.9%	75.0%	Hispanic/Latino	95.0%	76.0%	100%	95.0%
Interview	18	3	30	3	44.4%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	Asian	66.7%	0.0%	50.0%	100%
2nd Interview	8	0	10	2	87.5%		100.0%	50.0%	Hispanic/Latino	87.5%	N/A	100%	50.0%
Recommended for Hire	7	0	10	1	100.0%		90.0%	100.0%	White	100%	N/A	90.0%	100%
Offered	7	0	9	1	85.7%		88.9%	100.0%	Asian	85.7%	N/A	88.9%	100%

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Classified - Service Maintenance

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	113	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	9	88.9%	9	8	0.00		1		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	63	82.5%	63	52	0.00		11		YES
				White	29	93.1%	29	27	0.00		2		YES
Minimum Qualification Screening	99	White	96.3%	Asian	8	62.5%	8	5	0.00	-5.06	3	YES	YES
				Black/African American	10	90.0%	10	9	0.31	-1.05	1		
				Hispanic/Latino	52	90.4%	50	47	0.04	-2.26	3	YES	
Committee Screening	89	White	92.3%	Asian	5	80.0%	5	4	0.33	-1.03	1		
				Black/African American	9	55.6%	8	5	0.00	-4.14	3	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	47	80.9%	43	38	0.01	-2.95	5	YES	YES
Interview Pending	72	Hispanic/Latino	78.9%	Asian	4	75.0%	3	3	0.61	-0.19	0		
				Black/African American	5	60.0%	4	3	0.28	-1.04	1		
				White	24	75.0%	19	18	0.39	-0.47	1		
Interview	55	Asian	66.7%	Black/African American	3	0.0%	2	0	0.04	-2.45	2	YES	
				Hispanic/Latino	30	33.3%	20	10	0.00	-3.87	10	YES	YES
				White	18	44.4%	12	8	0.04	-2.00	4	YES	
2nd Interview	20	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	2	50.0%	2	1	0.00		1		YES
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				White	8	87.5%	8	7	0.00		1		YES
Recommended for Hire	18	White	100.0%	Asian	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	10	90.0%	10	9	0.00		1		YES
Offered	17	Asian	100.0%	Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	9	88.9%	9	8	0.00		1		YES
				White	7	85.7%	7	6	0.00		1		YES

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Classified - Service Maintenance

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
Application Received	37	103	81.1%	87.4%	Male	92.8%
Minimum Qualification Screening	30	90	86.7%	90.0%	Male	96.3%
Committee Screening	26	81	76.9%	82.7%	Male	93.0%
Interview Pending	20	67	80.0%	76.1%	Female	95.1%
Interview	16	51	18.8%	43.1%	Male	43.5%
2nd Interview	3	22	100.0%	90.9%	Female	90.9%
Recommended for Hire	3	20	100.0%	90.0%	Female	90.0%
Offered	3	18	66.7%	77.8%	Male	85.7%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Classified - Service Maintenance

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	140	Male	87.4%	Female	37	81.1%	32	30	0.18	-1.15	2		
Minimum Qualification Screening	120	Male	90.0%	Female	30	86.7%	27	26	0.35	-0.61	1		
Committee Screening	107	Male	82.7%	Female	26	76.9%	22	20	0.29	-0.78	2		
Interview Pending	87	Female	80.0%	Male	67	76.1%	54	51	0.25	-0.79	3		
Interview	67	Male	43.1%	Female	16	18.8%	7	3	0.04	-1.97	4		
2nd Interview	25	Female	100.0%	Male	22	90.9%	22	20	0.00		2		YES
Recommended for Hire	23	Female	100.0%	Male	20	90.0%	20	18	0.00		2		YES
Offered	21	Male	77.8%	Female	3	66.7%	2	2	0.53	-0.46	0		

Skilled Crafts

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received**, **Committee Screening**, and **Interview Pending** phases of the hiring process. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Application Received** and **Committee Screening** phases. Female applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Application Received** phase.

Due to attrition in the later phases, group sizes are too small to yield statistically relevant differences.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants, this group is not a monitored group.

The 80% Rule analysis identified differences in pass rates that were not detected by the statistical significance tests. Specifically, differences were identified for Hispanic/Latino applicants for the **Interview** phase.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified - Skilled Crafts

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic / Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Asian
Application Received	9	2	2	8	88.9%	50.0%	100.0%	62.5%	Hispanic/Latino	88.9%	50.0%	100%	62.5%
Minimum Qualification Screening	8	1	2	5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	White	100%	100%	100%	100%
Committee Screening	8	1	2	5	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%	80.0%	Hispanic/Latino	87.5%	0.0%	100%	80.0%
Interview Pending	7	0	2	4	85.7%		100.0%	75.0%	Hispanic/Latino	85.7%	N/A	100%	75.0%
Interview	6	0	2	3	33.3%		50.0%	66.7%	Asian	50.0%	N/A	75.0%	100%
2nd Interview	2	0	1	2	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	White	100%	N/A	100%	100%
Recommended for Hire	2	0	1	2	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	White	100%	N/A	100%	100%
Offered	2	0	1	2	50.0%		100.0%	100.0%	Hispanic/Latino	50.0%	N/A	100%	100%

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Classified - Skilled Crafts

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Hire %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	21	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	8	62.5%	8	5	0.00		3		YES
				Black/African American	2	50.0%	2	1	0.00		1		YES
				White	9	88.9%	9	8	0.00		1		YES
Minimum Qualification Screening	16	White	100.0%	Asian	5	100.0%	5	5	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	2	100.0%	2	2	1.00		0		
Committee Screening	16	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	5	80.0%	5	4	0.00		1		YES
				Black/African American	1	0.0%	1	0	0.00		1		YES
				White	8	87.5%	8	7	0.00		1		YES
Interview Pending	13	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	4	75.0%	4	3	0.00		1		YES
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				White	7	85.7%	7	6	0.00		1		YES
Interview	11	Asian	66.7%	Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	2	50.0%	1	1	0.56	-0.50	0		
				White	6	33.3%	4	2	0.10	-1.73	2		
2nd Interview	5	White	100.0%	Asian	2	100.0%	2	2	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
Recommended for Hire	5	White	100.0%	Asian	2	100.0%	2	2	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
Offered	5	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	2	100.0%	2	2	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				White	2	50.0%	2	1	0.00		1		YES

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Classified – Skilled Crafts

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
Application Received	2	23	0.0%	82.6%	Male	0.0%
Minimum Qualification Screening	0	19		100.0%	Male	100.0%
Committee Screening	0	19		78.9%	Male	100.0%
Interview Pending	0	15		86.7%	Male	100.0%
Interview	0	13		38.5%	Male	100.0%
2nd Interview	0	5		100.0%	Male	100.0%
Recommended for Hire	0	5		100.0%	Male	100.0%
Offered	0	5		80.0%	Male	100.0%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Skilled Crafts

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Hire %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	25	Male	82.6%	Female	2	0.0%	2	0	0.03	-3.08	2	YES	
Minimum Qualification Screening	19	Male	100.0%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Committee Screening	19	Male	78.9%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Interview Pending	15	Male	86.7%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Interview	13	Male	38.5%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		
2nd Interview	5	Male	100.0%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Recommended for Hire	5	Male	100.0%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Offered	5	Male	80.0%	Female	0		0	0	1.00		0		

Technical Paraprofessional

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received**, **Committee Screening**, **2nd Interview**, **Recommended for Hire**, and **Offered** phases. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Application Received** and **Committee Screening** phases. Hispanic/Latino applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Interview Pending**, **Interview**, and **2nd Interview** phases. Female applicants had a statistically significant difference for the **2nd Interview** phase.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants and male applicants, these groups are not monitored groups for purposes of EEO planning.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified - Technical Paraprofessional

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian
Application Received	188	22	97	155	85.1%	59.1%	83.5%	71.6%	White	100%	69.4%	98.1%	84.1%
Minimum Qualification Screening	160	13	81	111	86.9%	84.6%	88.9%	87.4%	Hispanic/Latino	97.7%	95.2%	100%	98.3%
Committee Screening	139	11	72	97	64.7%	54.5%	80.6%	46.4%	Hispanic/Latino	80.4%	67.7%	100%	57.6%
Interview Pending	90	6	58	45	84.4%	83.3%	75.9%	86.7%	Asian	97.4%	96.2%	87.5%	100%
Interview	76	5	44	39	35.5%	40.0%	20.5%	35.9%	Black/African American	88.8%	100%	51.1%	89.7%
2nd Interview	27	2	9	14	66.7%	100.0%	88.9%	78.6%	Black/African American	66.7%	100%	88.9%	78.6%
Recommended for Hire	18	2	8	11	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	72.7%	Black/African American	83.3%	100%	100%	72.7%
Offered	15	2	8	8	86.7%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	Black/African American	86.7%	100%	100%	87.5%

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Classified - Technical Paraprofessional

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	466	White	85.1%	Asian	155	71.6%	132	111	0.00	-4.72	21	YES	YES
				Black/African American	22	59.1%	19	13	0.00	-3.43	6	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	97	83.5%	83	81	0.37	-0.44	2		
Minimum Qualification Screening	368	Hispanic/Latino	88.9%	Asian	111	87.4%	99	97	0.35	-0.50	2		
				Black/African American	13	84.6%	12	11	0.43	-0.49	1		
				White	160	86.9%	142	139	0.24	-0.81	3		
Committee Screening	322	Hispanic/Latino	80.6%	Asian	97	46.4%	78	45	0.00	-8.50	33	YES	YES
				Black/African American	11	54.5%	9	6	0.05	-2.18	3	YES	
				White	139	64.7%	112	90	0.00	-4.71	22	YES	YES
Interview Pending	200	Asian	86.7%	Black/African American	6	83.3%	5	5	0.58	-0.24	0		
				Hispanic/Latino	58	75.9%	50	44	0.02	-2.42	6	YES	YES
				White	90	84.4%	78	76	0.31	-0.62	2		
Interview	164	Black/African American	40.0%	Asian	39	35.9%	16	14	0.36	-0.52	2		
				Hispanic/Latino	44	20.5%	18	9	0.00	-2.65	9	YES	YES
				White	76	35.5%	30	27	0.25	-0.80	3		
2nd Interview	52	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	14	78.6%	14	11	0.00		3		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	9	88.9%	9	8	0.00		1		YES
				White	27	66.7%	27	18	0.00		9		YES
Recommended for Hire	39	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	11	72.7%	11	8	0.00		3		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	8	100.0%	8	8	1.00		0		
				White	18	83.3%	18	15	0.00		3		YES
Offered	33	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	8	87.5%	8	7	0.00		1		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	8	100.0%	8	8	1.00		0		
				White	15	86.7%	15	13	0.00		2		YES

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Classified – Technical Paraprofessional

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
Application Received	309	226	82.8%	75.2%	Female	90.8%
Minimum Qualification Screening	256	170	87.9%	87.6%	Female	99.7%
Committee Screening	225	149	68.0%	58.4%	Female	85.9%
Interview Pending	153	87	83.7%	81.6%	Female	97.5%
Interview	128	71	29.7%	29.6%	Female	99.6%
2nd Interview	38	21	71.1%	85.7%	Male	82.9%
Recommended for Hire	27	18	81.5%	88.9%	Male	91.7%
Offered	22	16	100.0%	81.3%	Female	81.3%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Classified - Technical Paraprofessional

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	541	Female	82.8%	Male	226	75.2%	187	170	0.00	-3.04	17	YES	YES
Minimum Qualification Screening	432	Female	87.9%	Male	170	87.6%	149	149	0.50	-0.10	0		
Committee Screening	380	Female	68.0%	Male	149	58.4%	101	87	0.01	-2.51	14	YES	YES
Interview Pending	246	Female	83.7%	Male	87	81.6%	73	71	0.34	-0.52	2		
Interview	205	Female	29.7%	Male	71	29.6%	21	21	0.55	-0.02	0		
2nd Interview	60	Male	85.7%	Female	38	71.1%	33	27	0.01	-2.58	6	YES	YES
Recommended for Hire	46	Male	88.9%	Female	27	81.5%	24	22	0.17	-1.22	2		
Offered	39	Female	100.0%	Male	16	81.3%	16	13	0.00		3		YES

Clerical / Secretarial

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Minimum Qualification Screening, Interview Pending, Interview, and 2nd Interview** phases. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Application Received, Interview Pending, and Recommended for Hire** phases. Hispanic/Latino applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Minimum Qualification Screening and Interview** phases. Female applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Interview Pending and Offered** phases.

Additionally, Asian applicants had an observed difference between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received and Committee Screening** phases, but those differences were not statistically significant.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants and male applicants, these groups are not monitored groups.

The 80% Rule analysis identified differences in pass rates that were not detected by the statistical significance tests. Specifically, differences were identified for Asian applicants for the **Committee Screening** phase.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified - Clerical / Secretarial

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian
Application Received	77	13	45	26	93.5%	76.9%	95.6%	88.5%	Hispanic/Latino	97.9%	80.5%	100%	92.6%
Minimum Qualification Screening	72	10	43	23	91.7%	100.0%	86.0%	95.7%	Black/African American	91.7%	100%	86.0%	95.7%
Committee Screening	66	10	37	22	62.1%	60.0%	64.9%	45.5%	Hispanic/Latino	95.8%	92.5%	100%	70.1%
Interview Pending	41	6	24	10	75.6%	66.7%	100.0%	90.0%	Hispanic/Latino	75.6%	66.7%	100%	90.0%
Interview	31	4	24	9	19.4%	75.0%	16.7%	22.2%	Black/African American	25.8%	100%	22.2%	29.6%
2nd Interview	6	3	4	2	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	Black/African American	33.3%	100%	100%	50.0%
Recommended for Hire	2	3	4	1	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	White	100%	66.7%	100%	100%
Offered	2	2	4	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	White	100%	100%	100%	0.0%

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Classified - Clerical / Secretarial

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	162	Hispanic/Latino	95.6%	Asian	26	88.5%	25	23	0.11	-1.76	2	YES	YES
				Black/African American	13	76.9%	12	10	0.02	-3.26	2		
				White	77	93.5%	74	72	0.26	-0.87	2		
Minimum Qualification Screening	149	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	23	95.7%	23	22	0.00		1		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	43	86.0%	43	37	0.00		6		YES
				White	72	91.7%	72	66	0.00		6		YES
Committee Screening	136	Hispanic/Latino	64.9%	Asian	22	45.5%	14	10	0.05	-1.91	4		
				Black/African American	10	60.0%	6	6	0.49	-0.32	0		
				White	66	62.1%	43	41	0.36	-0.47	2		
Interview Pending	81	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	10	90.0%	10	9	0.00		1		YES
				Black/African American	6	66.7%	6	4	0.00		2		YES
				White	41	75.6%	41	31	0.00		10		YES
Interview	68	Black/African American	75.0%	Asian	9	22.2%	7	2	0.00	-3.66	5	YES	YES
				Hispanic/Latino	24	16.7%	18	4	0.00	-6.60	14	YES	YES
				White	31	19.4%	23	6	0.00	-7.15	17	YES	YES
2nd Interview	15	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	2	50.0%	2	1	0.00		1		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	4	100.0%	4	4	1.00		0		
				White	6	33.3%	6	2	0.00		4		YES
Recommended for Hire	10	White	100.0%	Asian	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		YES
				Black/African American	3	66.7%	3	2	0.00		1		
				Hispanic/Latino	4	100.0%	4	4	1.00		0		
Offered	9	White	100.0%	Asian	1	0.0%	1	0	0.00		1		YES
				Black/African American	2	100.0%	2	2	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	4	100.0%	4	4	1.00		0		

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Classified - Clerical / Secretarial

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
Application Received	155	44	92.9%	86.4%	Female	93.0%
Minimum Qualification Screening	144	38	92.4%	94.7%	Male	97.5%
Committee Screening	133	36	63.9%	55.6%	Female	86.9%
Interview Pending	85	20	78.8%	90.0%	Male	87.6%
Interview	67	18	25.4%	16.7%	Female	65.7%
2nd Interview	17	3	58.8%	66.7%	Male	88.2%
Recommended for Hire	10	2	100.0%	50.0%	Female	50.0%
Offered	10	1	90.0%	100.0%	Male	90.0%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Classified - Clerical / Secretarial

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	200	Female	92.9%	Male	44	86.4%	41	38	0.09	-1.69	3		
Minimum Qualification Screening	183	Male	94.7%	Female	144	92.4%	136	133	0.14	-1.28	3		
Committee Screening	170	Female	63.9%	Male	36	55.6%	23	20	0.19	-1.04	3		
Interview Pending	106	Male	90.0%	Female	85	78.8%	77	67	0.00	-3.43	10	YES	YES
Interview	86	Female	25.4%	Male	18	16.7%	5	3	0.29	-0.85	2		
2nd Interview	20	Male	66.7%	Female	17	58.8%	11	10	0.33	-0.69	1		
Recommended for Hire	12	Female	100.0%	Male	2	50.0%	2	1	0.00		1		YES
Offered	11	Male	100.0%	Female	10	90.0%	10	9	0.00		1		YES

Professional Non-Faculty

Asian applicants had statistically significant differences between expected and actual pass rates for the **Application Received**, **Committee Screening**, and **Interview Pending** phases of the hiring process. Black/African American applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Interview Pending** phase. Hispanic/Latino applicants had statistically significant differences for the **Application Received** and **Committee Screening** phases.

Due to attrition in the later phases, group sizes are too small to yield statistically relevant differences.

Although statistically significant differences were also identified for White applicants, this group is not monitored group.

The 80% Rule analysis identified differences in pass rates that were not detected by the statistical significance tests. Specifically, differences were identified for Asian applicants at the **Interview** phase, and for Black/African American applicants for the **Interview** phase.

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job Group: Classified - Professional Non-Faculty

Phase	Total				Percent Advanced				Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation			
	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian		White	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian
Application Received	23	4	6	13	95.7%	100.0%	83.3%	61.5%	Black/African American	95.7%	100%	83.3%	61.5%
Minimum Qualification Screening	22	4	5	8	77.3%	75.0%	80.0%	75.0%	Hispanic/Latino	96.6%	93.8%	100%	93.8%
Committee Screening	17	3	4	6	82.4%	100.0%	75.0%	83.3%	Black/African American	82.4%	100%	75.0%	83.3%
Interview Pending	14	3	3	5	57.1%	66.7%	100.0%	60.0%	Hispanic/Latino	57.1%	66.7%	100%	60.0%
Interview	8	2	3	3	37.5%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	White	100%	0.0%	88.9%	0.0%
2nd Interview	3	0	1	0	66.7%		100.0%		Hispanic/Latino	66.7%	N/A	100%	N/A
Recommended for Hire	2	0	1	0	100.0%		100.0%		White	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
Offered	2	0	1	0	50.0%		100.0%		Hispanic/Latino	50.0%	N/A	100%	N/A

Phase Analysis - Race/Ethnicity

Job group: Classified - Professional Non-Faculty

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	46	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	13	61.5%	13	8	0.00		5		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	6	83.3%	6	5	0.00		1		YES
				White	23	95.7%	23	22	0.00		1		YES
Minimum Qualification Screening	39	Hispanic/Latino	80.0%	Asian	8	75.0%	6	6	0.50	-0.35	0		
				Black/African American	4	75.0%	3	3	0.59	-0.25	0		
				White	22	77.3%	18	17	0.46	-0.32	1		
Committee Screening	30	Black/African American	100.0%	Asian	6	83.3%	6	5	0.00		1		YES
				Hispanic/Latino	4	75.0%	4	3	0.00		1		YES
				White	17	82.4%	17	14	0.00		3		YES
Interview Pending	25	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	5	60.0%	5	3	0.00		2		YES
				Black/African American	3	66.7%	3	2	0.00		1		YES
				White	14	57.1%	14	8	0.00		6		YES
Interview	16	White	37.5%	Asian	3	0.0%	1	0	0.24	-1.34	1		
				Black/African American	2	0.0%	1	0	0.39	-1.10	1		
				Hispanic/Latino	3	33.3%	1	1	0.68	-0.15	0		
2nd Interview	4	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				White	3	66.7%	3	2	0.00		1		YES
Recommended for Hire	3	White	100.0%	Asian	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Hispanic/Latino	1	100.0%	1	1	1.00		0		
Offered	3	Hispanic/Latino	100.0%	Asian	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				Black/African American	0		0	0	1.00		0		
				White	2	50.0%	2	1	0.00		1		YES

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job Group: Classified - Professional Non-Faculty

Phase	Female	Male	Female Advancement Rate	Male Advancement Rate	Group with Highest Success Rate	80% Rule Calculation
-------	--------	------	-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------

Application Received	43	14	83.7%	85.7%	Male	97.7%
Minimum Qualification Screening	36	12	80.6%	75.0%	Female	93.1%
Committee Screening	29	9	86.2%	77.8%	Female	90.2%
Interview Pending	25	7	64.0%	71.4%	Male	89.6%
Interview	16	5	25.0%	0.0%	Female	0.0%
2nd Interview	4	0	75.0%		Female	100.0%
Recommended for Hire	3	0	100.0%		Female	100.0%
Offered	3	0	66.7%		Female	100.0%

Phase Analysis - Gender

Job group: Classified - Professional Non-Faculty

Phase	Total Applicants	Best Selection Rate Group	Highest Group Pass %	Impacted Group	Total Impacted Applicants	Impacted Group Pass Rate	Impacted Expected Pass	Impacted Actual Pass	Binomial Exact	Z-Score	SF	SD Disparity	Binomial Exact Disparity
Application Received	57	Male	85.7%	Female	43	83.7%	37	36	0.42	-0.37	1		
Minimum Qualification Screening	48	Female	80.6%	Male	12	75.0%	10	9	0.42	-0.49	1		
Committee Screening	38	Female	86.2%	Male	9	77.8%	8	7	0.36	-0.73	1		
Interview Pending	32	Male	71.4%	Female	25	64.0%	18	16	0.27	-0.82	2		
Interview	21	Female	25.0%	Male	5	0.0%	1	0	0.24	-1.29	1		
2nd Interview	4	Female	75.0%	Male	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Recommended for Hire	3	Female	100.0%	Male	0		0	0	1.00		0		
Offered	3	Female	66.7%	Male	0		0	0	1.00		0		

Appendix B: Component 13

EEO PLAN COMPONENT 13

DISTRICT & COLLEGE ACTIVITIES

DEMONSTRATING ON-GOING COMMITMENT TO EEO/EMPLOYMENT DIVERSITY

Developed in collaboration with Liebert Cassidy Whitmore

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
PRE-HIRING			
Provide training to employees, students & trustees.* *This applies if you are planning training that goes beyond mandatory training for hiring committees. (53024.1(d))	Vice President of Human Resources/EEO Officer	What: Strengthen equitable, inclusive, and legally compliant hiring practices by ensuring all employees, students, and administrators serving on screening committees are trained on the District's hiring procedures, confidentiality requirements, and best practices for evaluating candidates. The training will support the District's commitment to identifying reasons to "screen in" qualified candidates, promoting equitable consideration, and advancing workforce diversity. Year 1: The District will develop and implement an online <i>Screening Committee Best Practices Training</i> for all employees, students, and administrators serving on screening committees. The training will address committee member roles and responsibilities, EEO and adverse impact awareness, implicit bias and microaggressions, confidentiality and conflict-of-interest requirements, equitable screening and interview practices, consistent application of evaluation criteria, consideration of candidates' demonstrated commitment to DEIA, and best practices for maintaining fairness, objectivity, and professionalism throughout the hiring process.	The effectiveness of this strategy will be evaluated through the number and percentage of screening committee members who complete the training prior to serving on a committee, as well as trends related to procedural concerns, process inconsistencies, and confidentiality violations throughout the recruitment process. The Vice President of Human Resources/EEO Officer will annually review training participation data, assessment results, participant feedback, and recruitment process outcomes to assess effectiveness and identify opportunities for continuous improvement. Findings will be used to strengthen screening committee practices, promote consistency and integrity in hiring processes, support equitable employment opportunities, and advance the District's EEO and

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
		Year 2: Review and update training content based on legal developments, District hiring procedures, participant feedback, and emerging best practices. Develop supplemental resources and guidance for screening committee chairs and members. Year 3: Evaluate training effectiveness through participant feedback, compliance monitoring, and hiring process assessments. Revise training materials, resources, and delivery methods as needed to support continuous improvement and equitable hiring outcomes.	workforce diversity goals.
Convey in publications and website the district's commitment to diversity & EEO. (53024.1(j))			
Review and update District EEO/DEI policy statement.* (53024.1(k)) *Cross-reference Plan Component 3			
Providing EEO/diversity enhancement resources and assistance to other districts. (53024.1(m))			
Addressing diversity issues in a transparent and collaborative fashion.			

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
(53024.1(o))			
Recurring activities related to improving student access and student success—with a nexus to EEO hiring.			Note: In order to include these activities in the EEO Plan a clear link should be drawn between these efforts and improving employment equity, diversity and inclusion. For example: cluster hiring to support specific groups of underserved students (e.g. African American, Latinx, Asian, etc.) could be included, if you conclude that this will give candidates from underrepresented groups greater opportunities to be recognized as highly qualified. In addition, as with other student-focused activities, a nexus to EEO will depend on showing that these activities are highly publicized to job applicants and are part of the district/college “face” and thus become part of your recruitment efforts.
Inclusion of (lawful) EEO deliverables in CEO and other administrator performance goals.			
ADD ADDITIONAL/ ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES IN ADDITIONAL ROWS HERE.			
HIRING			

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
Consistent and ongoing training for hiring committees. (53024.1(c)) *Cross reference Plan Component 8.	Include both: • Who is responsible for ensuring committees are trained; and • Who gets training		
Maintain updated job descriptions and job announcements. (53024.1(f))			
Board of trustees receives training on elimination of bias in hiring and employment at least once every election cycle. (53024.1(g))			
Assess "sensitivity to diversity" of all applicants. (53024.1(l))			Note: Describe mechanisms for giving meaningful consideration to applicants' demonstrated sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, gender, sexual orientation, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.
Maintaining updated curricula, texts, and/or course descriptions. (53024.1(n))			

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
Dedication of specified staff to EEO.			
Incentives for hard-to-hire areas/disciplines.			
Focused outreach and publications.			
Procedures for addressing diversity throughout hiring steps and levels			*Note: Hiring procedures are regulated separately in Title 5 and should be detailed in a separate document. EEO Plan should reference, align with and support hiring procedures, not supplant or reiterate them.
Recruitment efforts and strategies such as: • Use of demographic data • Job Fairs • CCC Registry • Relationships with external organizations & colleges	Vice President of Human Resources/EEO Officer	What: Utilize data-informed recruitment strategies, Career Connections programming, and strategic partnerships to expand awareness of careers within the California Community College system and attract diverse, qualified applicant pools reflective of the communities served by the District. Year 1: Partner with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and Bay 10 institutions to pilot the Northern California Career Discovery & Connections Expo. Continue utilizing workforce and applicant demographic data to identify recruitment priorities and outreach opportunities. Year 2: Evaluate participation and outcomes from the	Effectiveness will be measured by attendance and participation in the Northern California Career Discovery & Connections Expo and related outreach activities, representation of monitored groups within applicant pools, and participant feedback. The Vice President of Human Resources/EEO Officer, in collaboration with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, will review feedback and data to assess effectiveness and identify opportunities for continuous improvement in support of the District's EEO and workforce diversity goals.

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
		Career Discovery & Connections Expo and expand partnerships with colleges, universities, community organizations, workforce agencies, and professional associations to strengthen recruitment pipelines. Year 3: Assess the effectiveness of outreach partnerships, recruitment activities, and data-driven strategies on applicant pool diversity and recruitment outcomes; implement improvements to support workforce and EEO goals.	
ADD ADDITIONAL/ ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES IN ADDITIONAL ROWS HERE.			
POST-HIRING			
Conduct campus climate surveys & use this information. (53024.1(a))	Planning, Resources, Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), EEO Advisory Council, Senior Leadership Team	What: Utilize campus climate and employee engagement data to foster an inclusive, equitable, and supportive workplace environment. Year 1: Analyze campus climate and employee engagement survey results to identify strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement. Year 2: Implement initiatives responsive to survey findings, including employee engagement, professional development, leadership development, and workplace culture improvements. Year 3: Conduct a follow-up climate survey to assess progress, evaluate implemented initiatives, and identify priorities for the next EEO Plan cycle.	Effectiveness will be measured through employee participation rates in climate and engagement surveys, survey results related to inclusion, belonging, engagement, communication, and workplace culture, the number of initiatives developed in response to survey findings, participation in those initiatives, and improvements in key survey indicators over time. PRIE, the Senior Leadership Team, and the EEO Advisory Council will review survey results and initiative outcomes following each survey cycle and monitor progress to assess effectiveness, identify opportunities for continuous improvement, and support the District's EEO, employee engagement, and workforce diversity

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
			goals.
Conduct exit interviews & use this information. (53024.1(b))			
Professional development, mentoring, support and leadership opportunities for new employees. (53024.1(e))	Planning, Resources, Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), Professional Learning Committee (PLC), Classified Development Coordinator, EEO Advisory Council, Senior Leadership	What: Support employee success, engagement, retention, and career advancement through professional development, mentoring, onboarding, and leadership development opportunities. Year 1: Establish the Office of Employee and Organizational Development (OEOD) framework, launch foundational programming, and increase awareness of available services and resources. Year 2: Expand participation in mentoring, onboarding, leadership development, and professional learning opportunities; strengthen integration of OEOD services across the District. Year 3: Position OEOD as a strategic institutional partner by evaluating program effectiveness, enhancing services, and advancing employee growth and organizational success.	Effectiveness will be measured by participation in professional development, mentoring, onboarding, and leadership programs; representation of monitored groups; program satisfaction; employee engagement and retention indicators; and utilization of OEOD services and resources. The Office of Employee and Organizational Development, Senior Leadership Team, and the EEO Advisory Council will annually review these data to assess effectiveness, identify opportunities for improvement, and support the District's EEO, employee development, retention, and workforce diversity goals.
Timely and thoroughly investigate all harassment & discrimination complaints & take appropriate corrective			Note: distinguish between the separately required complaint procedures for addressing: 1) discrimination and harassment (which supports inclusive work environments); and 2) violations of the hiring process (which supports elimination of bias).

IMPLEMENTATION 	Who	What/When	Effectiveness Metrics & Review
action in all instances where a violation is found. (53024.1(h))			
Survey applicants who decline offers & use the information. (53024.1(p))			
Describe strategies developed to address any adverse impact identified in the process of carrying out the requirements of Component 10 of the EEO Plan.			Note: if this is added after adoption of your 3-year EEO Plan, also provide notification to the State Chancellor of your plan modification.
Describe strategies developed to address any underrepresentation identified in the process of carrying out the requirements of Components 11 & 12 of the EEO Plan.			Note: if this is added after adoption of your 3-year EEO Plan, also provide notification to the State Chancellor of your plan modification.
ADD ADDITIONAL/ ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES IN ADDITIONAL ROWS HERE.			